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Introduction

Archaeological Consulting Services conducted a late prehistoric cultural affiliation study for Grand Portage National Monument. The project included developing a background on the issues involved in linking the late prehistoric (A.D. 700 to 1600) record of often vague or poorly defined archeological cultures with a historic record in which conjectured band, tribal, and/or linguistic identities are known. The purpose of this project was to provide the basis for determining cultural affiliation in the event of the unintentional discovery of human remains or cultural items under the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act of 1990 (NAGPRA), and to provide for the Monument a synthesis of its late prehistoric archeological record.

Grand Portage occupied a unique position as a major entrepot for the early fur trade of the Upper Country; its reasons for selection by the Northwest Company being a sheltered bay and access to the river roads of the interior. The present-day National Monument includes not only the Depot on Grand Portage Bay, but also the site of Fort Charlotte on the Pigeon River and a portage trail linking the two, all of which are within the present lands of the Grand Portage Band of Minnesota Chippewa. Excavations at both the Depot and Fort Charlotte have produced a wealth of information regarding the fur trade. However, late prehistoric artifacts, features, and sites have neither been identified nor reported with the same enthusiasm as the fur trade materials. It is for this reason that a cultural affiliation study of the Monument required a simultaneous focus on the archeology of the Monument and immediate vicinity, to provide a site-specific context for the study, and a more broadly based examination of the archeology and historic resources of the region.

The term Ojibwe is used throughout the report and, as will be seen, has a variety of meanings depending on the context of its usage. Chippewa is used here only in its legal sense or in direct quotes, and of course the Ojibwe people's name for themselves, Anishnabeg, is acknowledged and respected. The name Saulteaux, apart from specific quotes and contexts in this discussion, is used to differentiate this group of seventeenth century migrants from the Sault Ste. Marie area from the Northern Ojibwe who, I argue, resided for at least 600 years in the western Lake Superior Basin.

Research Design

The study addressed the question of cultural affiliation by following these steps:

1. Assemble all relevant archeological, ethnohistoric, and historic reports and records with primary focus on the Monument and the area historically claimed by the Grand Portage Band between Isle Royale, Beaver Bay, Basswood Lake, Mille Lacs, and Nipigon River (Figure 1).

2. Evaluate these reports and characterize sites by archeological culture using ceramic types.

3. Construct a series of maps with accompanying text showing the distribution of archeological cultures for the study area.

4. Construct a map showing the major archeological sites discussed in the text.

5. Synthesize information provided by historical sources regarding band membership and composition to determine if, for example, multiethnic or multilingual bands existed that may account for multiple ceramic styles on a single site. An evaluation of settlement and seasonality will address the possibility of seasonal aggregations of single or multiethnic occupations that would alternatively explain the presence of more than one ceramic style on a single site.

6. Address linkages of archeological cultures and historic bands, and make identification of probable affiliation of archeological cultures to the historic Grand Portage Band of Minnesota Chippewa.
Figure 1. Grand Portage Band territory.
7. Provide brief summary statements of research needs that can be used to respond to Resource Management Plans, project statements for the Archeological Site Management Information System, or for 10-238 project statements anticipating budget calls for cultural resource projects (Appendix A).

8. Provide guidelines for evaluating the probable cultural affiliation of an "unanticipated discovery." This will include a synthesis of what is known about prehistoric and historic burial practices, and identify any unique attributes that may be helpful in making a determination of affiliation (Appendix B).

No new fieldwork or reanalysis of extant records or collections was undertaken for this project. It was well beyond the scope of the budget and expectations of the project to re-evaluate collections of artifacts and to re-evaluate ceramic classifications made by other archeologists.

Cultural/Historical Overview

The cultural/historical overview provides a framework for organizing the prehistoric archeological and historic cultures at Grand Portage and in the surrounding Lake Superior basin. This framework is consistent with terms and time periods employed in the northern tier of the Upper Great Lakes states and adjacent provinces of Canada. Cultural stages are subdivided into substages or phases that represent episodes in the cultural evolution of the historic Native Americans/First Nation. This partitioning of prehistory is, of course, arbitrary insofar as the changes that took place did not occur overnight. The use of copper, the manufacture of ceramics, the adoption of new hunting and fishing techniques, and the development of interband relations have no beginning and no end in the greater scheme of history and cultural evolution. However, to the archeologist, the prehistoric record is punctuated at times with "new" things that seem logical places to identify a change of some magnitude separating them from previous and subsequent cultural developments. These are the bases for the stage and substage classification schemes commonly used in archeology. As will be seen below, the same principles apply to the definition of archeological cultures within a given substage.

Population estimates for any period are virtually impossible. Using the numbers of sites as a gross index of population growth it is possible to state that population numbers rose steadily throughout prehistory. Population growth is also inferred from the evidence for increasing efficiency in acquiring and storing food. While this hardly answers the question of how many people were here in the past, few would argue with the assumption that population steadily increased from the Archaic through Woodland to Historic times. There may have been major increases in population growth in late prehistory as the mobility of canoe travel and the advantages of food production and storage techniques made possible the "banking of resources" in an ever broadening regional economy which linked the vast fisheries of the Upper Great Lakes to the northern margins of horticulture to the south.

Late Paleoindian/Early Archaic

Sites dating as early as 8,000 years ago dot the Lake Superior basin. Following the retreat of the last glaciation prehistoric hunters found ample prey among the caribou, bison, elk, and moose in an environment then in transition from a periglacial tundra to the present southern boreal forest.

Archeological remains are largely confined to stone tools and waste material left over from stone tool production. Large chipped stone spears and knives with distinctive flaking patterns are typical of these early cultures. The classic fluted points, often found associated with the remains of mastodon, mammoth, or bison are uncommon in this area. The first recognizable archeological culture is the Plano Tradition. On the north shore of Lake Superior, Plano artifacts have been found at a number of sites preserved, in part, by the effects of isostatic rebound of the shoreline that have elevated the already high beaches well above the current levels of Lake Superior. Notable are the quarry/habitation sites Brohm and Cummins near Thunder Bay, Ontario (Dawson 1983).
The south shore of Lake Superior is less well known than the north, but archeological finds in recent years have shown that the antiquity of this area extends at least as far back as 9,000 years ago. The stone tools of the Flambeau (ca. 7000 B.C.) and Minocqua (ca. 6000-5000 B.C.) phases were initially defined from sites in northern Wisconsin (Salzer 1974). Like the Plano Tradition artifacts to the north, the Flambeau and Minocqua artifacts are characterized by distinctive flaking patterns and a persistent use of Hixton silicified sandstone, which has its source in south-central Wisconsin.

Native copper from the Lake Superior region becomes increasingly important throughout prehistory. The best-documented association of copper with this early period comes from the Itasca site in northern Minnesota that has been dated between 7600 and 5500 B.C. (Shay 1971). The evidence for a human presence in the Superior basin during this period is gradually becoming better known, but the Plano hunters' interest in copper has yet to be demonstrated. Our knowledge of the Plano Tradition in this area is very rudimentary in contrast to subsequent periods where we have not only artifacts but also actual food remains and habitation sites that provide a fuller knowledge of the past lifeways of these people.

**Archaic**

The Archaic stage in eastern North America has been characterized as having "widely flung and locally variable expressions" (Fitzhugh 1972:1). Two cultural traditions germane to the prehistory of Grand Portage are recognized for the Archaic stage: the Shield Archaic, and the "Old Copper Culture". Generalizations that distinguish these from the earlier Plano Tradition artifacts include more diversified styles of tools, the harvesting of a wider range of plant and animal resources, and larger populations.

A wider range of stone and copper tools reflect an increasingly intimate knowledge of locally available resources and a trend to specialized tool types with which these resources were harvested and processed. Small scraping tools made from chert appear with increasing frequency and reflect the processing of hides necessary for clothing and shelter. Projectile points/knives undergo a reduction in size and a new method of hafting involving the use of notches placed in the corners or sides of the bases of the points. Copper gaffs are believed to reflect the intensification of the native fishery as well as the use of a material virtually unutilized in earlier times. Although none have been discovered in our area, fish weirs dating to the Archaic stage have been found in southwestern Ontario.

Some of the differences among Archaic populations may be attributed to local variability in environmental factors which, in turn, afforded variability in the ways in which the people adapted or responded to their environment. Other differences may result from non-environmental factors that have more to do with the evolution of culture and society apart from the environmental constraints. Whatever the causes of dissimilarity, there is ample evidence for interaction among prehistoric groups seen in the long distance movement of raw materials, including copper, across cultural boundaries. The Late Archaic substage witnessed an intensification of local hunting, fishing, and collecting strategies that gave structure to the relationships among neighboring groups, facilitating exchange of both goods and information across wide areas.

The Shield Archaic occupied an area on the Canadian Shield from Keewatin District to Cape Breton, Nova Scotia (Wright 1972b). The distribution of Shield Archaic sites suggests extensive use of watercraft and primary exploitation of moose, caribou, fish, and beaver. Bone preservation on Shield sites is generally poor and the food resources are inferred from the location of sites across the landscape. In the material culture of the Shield Archaic one finds no clear-cut stylistic patterns, but rather an array of small utilitarian tools made of locally available raw materials.

Disagreement exists regarding the pedigree of the Shield Archaic. Some archeologists believe that cultural evolution in the Canadian Shield occurred as an in-place transition from Plano to Shield Archaic to Laurel (Wright 1972b). According to others (Buchner 1979), the concept of the Shield Archaic is much too large and inclusive, and it likely includes smaller units that thus far have fallen outside of our ability to identify them. In
either case, the archeological identification of Shield Archaic, and the discrimination between it and Woodland assemblages that lack pottery, has been difficult owing to the persistence of stone tool forms that clearly began in the Archaic and continued into the Woodland stage.

The second Archaic archeological culture is equally unpopular with respect to its title and uncertain with respect to its meaning. The Old Copper Culture, Old Copper complex, or simply Old Copper, began as early as 3000 B.C. and continued to around 1200 B.C. (Stoltman 1986). The geographical distribution of Old Copper has its heart in northeastern Wisconsin, near the copper-producing districts of Keweenaw and Ontonagon on Lake Superior's south shore. Artifacts attributed to Old Copper are found well away from this core, however, and extend around the west end of Lake Superior, into the Lake Michigan basin, into the northern reaches of the Midwest Riverine area, west to the plains periphery, and east as far as the Ottawa River between Ontario and Quebec (Mason 1981).

The characteristic artifact forms, fashioned of copper, represent the most varied use of this material at any time in Upper Great Lakes prehistory. Only during the Middle Woodland in the Hopewell culture and later in Mississippian culture does copper working assume comparable proportions, although in much different expressions. Archaic artifacts include large (by Terminal Woodland standards) spearheads, knives, gaffs, adzes, as well as an array of forms more familiar later in time, such as awls, tubular and discoidal beads, and hooks (Wittry 1957).

**Initial Woodland**

The temporal boundary between the Archaic and Woodland stages is archeologically defined by the introduction of pottery. In eastern North America south of the boreal forest the first ceramic-producing cultures are referred to as Early Woodland, dating as early as 1000 B.C. Early Woodland pottery is characteristically coil constructed and thick, with cord-marked interiors and exteriors. By the time of the Middle Woodland cultural pattern, beginning about 300 B.C., ceramics had a wider variety of shapes, surface treatments, and types of decoration (Mason 1981). It was at this juncture that ceramics made their appearance in the material culture of the Shield Archaic (Wright 1972b), or were brought into the region around and north of Lake Superior by a different culture to the south (Buchner 1979). Echoing an earlier sentiment, Wright (1968:47) states that, “The evidence from the sites under consideration strongly suggests that ceramics are not an indigenous part of Ojibwa material culture.” Mason (1981:286) summarizes the ambivalence with which he believes pots were accepted in the north: “There is a high probability that there were some people in the Laurel country who did not manufacture or use earthenware but who were fully contemporaneous with those who did and that the only empirical difference between their respective sites would be the presence or absence of sherd.”

In practice, the terms “Initial Woodland” and “Laurel” in the Lake Superior basin mean the same thing. Other Initial/Early Woodland archeological cultures (e.g., North Bay of Northern Lake Michigan and the south shore of Lake Superior and Saugeen culture of southwestern Ontario) are peripheral to this analysis, although they represent similar cultural developments of a more southerly Woodland stage cultural evolution (Mason 1981). The Laurel focus was defined by Wilford's (1941) work in northern Minnesota. His definition was subsequently expanded by MacNeish (1958) to cover southern Manitoba. Laurel sites are now known from a large area north of the Great Lakes and between Saskatchewan and central Quebec.

Other than the apparent deletion of large copper artifacts from the tool inventory and a shift in lithic raw material preferences, there were no fundamental changes in the lithic and copper technology and their products from previous Archaic material culture. Net sinkers appear to be new in the region at this time (Wright 1967), and trade items such as Saugeen pottery from southwestern Ontario, shell from Manitoba, and Yellowstone obsidian occur on both sides of Lake Superior (Janzen 1968; Wright 1967). There is a proliferation of small chert endscrapers in the Laurel culture, which is attributed to the functional needs of an economy increasingly devoted to fishing (Janzen 1968). Copper tools and ornaments in Laurel assemblages include the typical range
of small forms common throughout prehistory, but there are no copper tools or ornaments which are considered distinctively Laurel in style. It is assumed that copper was one of the items used by the Laurel people in the context of gift exchange or trade in the acquisition of nonlocal commodities. The degree of interregional exchange appears not to be too great, however, since nonlocal items rarely occur in great numbers.

It is Laurel pottery that identifies this culture. Vessels were constructed by coiling and there was a modest use of grit temper. Vessels are hard and usually conoidal with straight rims and squared lips. Decoration made by dentate stamping, linear stamping, push-pull, incising, pseudo-scallop shell impression, and use of punctates and bosses, was confined to the upper 1/2 to 1/3 of the vessel that is otherwise smooth. Cord-marked exteriors and the use of cord-wrapped ticks for decoration, the hallmarks of Terminal Woodland ceramics, do not occur in Laurel assemblages (Mason 1981).

Along the southern periphery of its range along the Rainy River and Boundary Waters on the international border, are the largest Laurel sites. At the Smith Mound in northern Minnesota, the mode of interment was by bundle burial in small ossuaries. There was also evidence for preburial ritual treatment of the dead in the form of dismemberment and cleaning of bones (Mason 1981).

*Terminal Woodland*

There is no sudden change in artifact style to mark the beginning of the Terminal Woodland substage. Instead it is defined in terms of the trends that set it apart from its predecessor (Gibbon and Caine 1980). Terminal Woodland is characterized by increased localized cultural differentiation measurable in increments of stylistic variability and raw material use. Subsistence practices became highly specialized in areas with unique resources, such as the wild rice district in northern Wisconsin, Minnesota and adjacent portions of Canada, or the fisheries at Sault Ste. Marie and Fond du Lac. There is evidence for an increase in population size in the Terminal Woodland in the form of a higher density of sites and larger site size (Fitting 1975; Mason 1981).

From the beginning of the Terminal Woodland substage, roughly from A.D. 700, to recorded history the Upper Great Lakes was the scene of a complex interplay of archaeological cultures representing three linguistic groups which were, in turn, partitioned into what are traditionally thought of by archaeologists as culturally discrete and autonomous units. The vast diversity in ceramic styles in the Upper Great Lakes region has been described in various terms ranging from chaotic to cosmopolitan. The evidence of group composition and interaction among archaeological cultures, such as Blackduck, Selkirk, Juntunen, Huron, and Peninsular Woodland, must be explored using distinctive types of stone used for tools, copper artifacts, and ceramic styles and clay sources. Ultimately, the relationship between ethnographic and ethnohistoric groups, on the one hand, must be contrasted with archaeological cultures on the other to provide a model of group composition and identity that bridges prehistory and history.

The major Terminal Woodland archaeological cultures represented on north shore sites covered a broad area encompassing the entire Lake Superior (Figure 2). Included is the Straits of Mackinac sequence from the Juntunen site, the Peninsular Woodland, and its cognates primarily from northern Lakes Michigan and Huron, Blackduck culture, Selkirk composite, and Wanikan culture from the rice district of northern Minnesota and adjacent areas of Ontario and Manitoba, and the Huron-Petun from northern Lake Huron. The cultural-historical sequence is explained in detail below.
Figure 2. Major Terminal Woodland archaeological sites/areas.
Archeological Cultures

What is an Archeological Culture?

The definition of archeological cultures employed in this study utilizes an isomorphic view of the relationship between style and raw materials and a corresponding archeological culture. Simply put, this means that one style of pot represents one archeological culture. This view is based on the assumption that potters used decorative style to identify themselves as members of a specific group of people. In the Great Lakes region archeological sites usually include a wide variety of ceramic styles indicative of more than one archeological culture. Traditional explanations of this phenomenon include marriage practices where the women (who we presume were the potters) of one group marry into another, raiding and warfare in which female potters are captured, copying of styles among groups, and trade and exchange of pottery vessels. All can be documented to varying degrees for the Upper Great Lakes region, but none fully or independently explain the archeological association of so many different varieties of pottery on so many sites in so large a region, nor do they exhaust the scope of potential explanations of this phenomenon.

The Terminal Woodland substage of the Woodland period offers an incredible diversity of ceramics, interpreted here as the product of several archeological cultures who utilized an area's resources independently and/or in concert with one another. Blackduck, Selkirk, Juntunen, Peninsular Woodland, and Huron are the most prevalent manifestations of well-defined Terminal Woodland archeological cultures occurring on the north shore and Isle Royale (Clark 1991, 1995). The commingling of a wide variety of ceramics in the Upper Great Lakes is a fair representation of the ethnic composition of the groups responsible for leaving the archeological record: what Cleland (1971:93) has referred to as "the cosmopolitan quality" of the Terminal Woodland sites throughout the region.

Archeological Cultures of the Terminal Woodland Substage

Blackduck

The Blackduck culture, initially defined by Wilford (1941, 1955), underwent a number of later modifications (Evans 1961; Hlady 1970; MacNeish 1958; Wright 1965). The core area of Blackduck is in the Rainy River area between Minnesota, Ontario, and Manitoba, but has also been found across the north shore of Lake Superior to the Straits of Mackinac and into the northern reaches of the Lake Michigan drainage (Figure 3). Blackduck dates from A.D. 700-800 to around A.D. 1100 (Lugenebel 1978) or A.D. 1750 (Lyott et al. 1986; Symns 1977). According to Arthurs (1986), Blackduck along the Rainy River is replaced by ceramics representing the Selkirk and Sandy Lake archeological cultures. He attributes this local phenomenon to an expansion of Selkirk from the southern fringes of the boreal forest into northern Minnesota to exploit the rich wild rice resources there. Away from the Rainy River, there is evidence to suggest that Blackduck, Selkirk, and Sandy Lake are contemporaneous (Symns 1977).

Blackduck pottery is distinctive, although it shares similarities with Mackinac, Heints Creek, Madison, Kathy, and Clay River ceramic traditions. Typical Blackduck vessels are globular in shape with triangular or wedge-shaped rims decorated with complex cordwrapped stick impressions and exterior punctates. Bodies are cordmarked, often with brushing or combing on the neck (Figure 4).

Subsistence practices utilized local resources without horticulture, wild rice being particularly important in the Blackduck core area. Gibbon and Caine (1980) identify several related trends from Middle (Initial) to Late (Terminal) Woodland that are germane to the Blackduck culture. There is an increase in rice-processing features, in site numbers and size, and in small limited activity sites.

Dawson (1975, 1982) places Blackduck in the southwestern Algonquian Culture Area, identifying it as having been produced by the "Ojibwe and associated groups" (1975:32). He also notes its widespread distribution in the Lake Superior Basin and its association with Mackinac ware.
Figure 4. Blackduck ceramics.
Selkirk

Dating between A.D. 700 and 1750, Selkirk is known from the area north and west of Lake Superior (Arturs 1978; Rajnovich 1983; Wright 1981). Initially defined by MacNeish (1958), Selkirk was subsequently expanded to include a number of related ceramic style groups (Hlady 1970, 1971). Selkirk ceramics are found in an area bounded by northern Saskatchewan, the Hudson Bay Lowlands, the north shore of Lake Superior, and northern Minnesota (Rajnovich 1983:52) (Figure 3). In a reanalysis of Selkirk ceramics, Sym (1977:71) groups a number of complexes into a larger “Selkirk Composite”. The individual complexes exhibit sufficient integrity of style and regional distribution to suggest that they formed partitions within the composite. The composite represents the maximum aggregation of related style groups that constitute Selkirk as an archaeological culture.

Rajnovich believes that Selkirk represents a local evolution out of the Initial Woodland Laurel tradition:

The Selkirk prehistoric culture was one of a number of archaeological cultures that covered the Canadian Shield, from eastern Saskatchewan to western Quebec, from about 1000 years ago to 400 years ago. They were the ancestors of today’s Algonkian speakers of the same area. The ancestors of all of these Late Woodland peoples lived throughout the Middle Woodland Period, from about 2,000 years ago to about 1000 years ago; their distinctive artifact assemblages are known to archaeologists as Laurel, and the distribution of Laurel sites is remarkably similar to the distribution of the pictographs all across the shield (1994:46-47).

Selkirk is identified archeologically by its fabric-impressed ceramics with little or no decoration (Figure 5). According to Rajnovich (1983), the earliest Selkirk pottery is found in northern Manitoba where conical bases on vessels strongly imply a Laurel origin for Selkirk with a subsequent diffusion to the south and east. Closer to Lake Superior in southeastern Manitoba and the Lake of the Woods area of northwestern Ontario the earliest Selkirk material is “simple undecorated ceramics (Alexander Fabric Impressed)...followed later by decorated types influenced by Blackduck” (Rajnovich 1983:58).

Rajnovich (1983) favors contemporaneity between Selkirk, Blackduck and Sandy Lake. Wright (1968) and Dawson (1982) see Selkirk as ancestral to the historic Cree in northwestern Ontario and adjacent Manitoba.
Figure 5. Selkirk ceramics.
Sandy Lake/Wanikan

The Wanikan culture was defined by Birk (1977). Sandy Lake pottery, the diagnostic artifact of the Wanikan culture, was identified earlier by Cooper and Johnson (1964) who suggested that the Wanikan culture evolved out of the Clam River focus, and thought to represent an occupation of Siouan speakers. Chronologically, the Wanikan culture falls between A.D. 1000 and A.D. 1700. Sandy Lake pottery has a maximum distribution from the Mississippi headwaters area east to Lake Nipigon, north and west as far as eastern Manitoba, with its area of primary concentration in the Lake of the Woods and Rainy Lake area on the international border (Arthurs 1978) (Figure 6). The Norway Lake site in northern Minnesota contained a substantial Wanikan component associated with Blackduck ceramics. Settlement and subsistence are not well known but are believed to reflect a predictable focus on wild rice and other aquatic resources of the region.

Like Selkirk, Wanikan is identified primarily by its pottery that is often difficult to distinguish from its late prehistoric cord-marked contemporaries (Figure 7). Temper is predominantly shell in the southern range of Sandy Lake pottery, changing to grit in the north (Peterson 1986). It is described as having, “thin-walled, globular pots with straight, thin rims, exterior surface treatment of vertical cording or smoothed exterior, and occasional interior or exterior punctates. Decoration is confined to interior lip notching, although some vessels show influence from other wares, such as Oneota, with trailing or stamping” (Lake Superior Basin Workshop 1988).

The ethnic identity of the makers of Sandy Lake pottery is uncertain. That they were likely Siouan speakers is generally accepted. That they were ancestral to the Assiniboine is possible and not inconsistent with known early historic distributions of the Assiniboine west and north of Lake Superior, including Lake Nipigon, Isle Royale, and the Grand Portage Band territory.

Peninsular Woodland

“Peninsular Woodland” is a term that refers to the vast array of cord-marked vessels found from the north shore of Lake Superior, south well into the Lake Michigan and Lake Huron Basins. This inclusive “type” has not found currency among archeologists in the United States, who favor terms that relate to specific localized ceramic types and varieties. The Mackinac phase pottery from the Juntunen site favors cord-marked and fabric impressed exteriors on short squat vessels with round bases and square lips. Decoration is by the use of punctations and geometric designs on rims and necks executed with a cord-wrapped stick. Mackinac ware is broadly similar to most contemporaneous ceramics from surrounding areas, including Blackduck, Wayne (southern Michigan), Princess Point (southwest Ontario), Heins Creek (Door Peninsula of Wisconsin and western Upper Peninsula), and Canton (northern Illinois, southern Wisconsin) wares.

Dawson (1982) links the Peninsular Woodland with the historic Sauk, Fox, and Kickapoo. No attempt will be made to address this, other than to point out that the “confusion” of identity is likely mirrored in the Algonquian speakers of southern Lake Superior and reflects highly mobile populations with many shared cultural traits. The distribution of Peninsular Woodland pottery (Figure 8) appears to stay fairly close to the Lake Superior littoral, similar to the distribution of the Juntunen materials.
Figure 6. Geographical distribution of Sandy Lake ceramics.
Figure 7. Sandy Lake (above) and Peninsular Woodland (below) ceramics.
The Lakes phase of northern Wisconsin and western Upper Michigan is but one of several "Peninsular Woodland" archaeological cultures. It is thought that the Lakes phase of the Terminal Woodland evolved directly from its Middle Woodland Nakomis phase ancestor, appearing archeologically as a population explosion in an area of northern Wisconsin only sparsely inhabited previously (Salzer 1974, 1986). The Lakes phase is believed to date between A.D. 600 or 700 and A.D. 1400. Subsistence reflects local variation and constraints; a seasonally mobile strategy of fishing, small mammal hunting, riceing, and fowling was followed in this area of extensive marsh and lakes. Mortuary practices included inhumation of bundled secondary and flexed primary burials as well as cremations in simple effigy, linear, or conical mounds.

Lakes phase pottery is cord-marked with decoration by cord-wrapped stick, cord, and punctuates (Figure 7). The problem of a lack of stylistic boundaries is evident with the Lakes phase. Lakes phase ceramics are not sufficiently distinctive to allow consistent identification in analysis, and disagreement or uncertainty regarding Lakes phase and other Peninsular Woodland ceramics is likely to be a problem.

Juntunen

The Terminal Woodland sequence, determined from excavations at the Juntunen site (McPherron 1967), included three cultural phases: Mackinac phase (ca. A.D. 800-1000), Bois Blanc phase (ca. A.D. 1000-1200), and the Juntunen phase (ca. A.D. 1200-1450). Subsequent reanalysis of the collection raises some doubt as to the validity of the middle Bois Blanc phase, and has broadened the chronological span of the Juntunen phase almost up to the time of contact, ca. A.D. 1100-1450 (Claire McHale Milner, personal communication 1989; McHale Milner and O'Shea 1990).

In McPherron's (1967) initial analysis of the cultural/chronological sequence at the Juntunen site, he described a shift in interaction sphere from west in the Mackinac phase to the east in the later Juntunen phase. Based on shared stylistic similarities between the Juntunen phase ceramics and the Middleport and Uren substages of the Ontario Iroquois Tradition, and the suggestion of a longhouse structure at the Juntunen site, McPherron suggested that the Juntunen phase was best considered the product of an Iroquoian group.

Wright (1968, 1972a) takes exception to McPherron's interpretation, stating that:

Although a number of ceramic attribute equivalents exist between certain Late Woodland ceramics in Michigan and the ceramics of the Ontario Iroquois Tradition, it is my opinion that the parallels are of such a general nature that proposals of origin are placed in a very hazardous position. In short, I cannot see a direct relationship between the Ontario Iroquois Tradition ceramics of Southern Ontario and the push-pull ceramics of Michigan and Northern Ontario [1968:49].

Wright viewed the problem from the perspective of the Michipicoten site in the eastern Lake Superior basin where his excavation revealed a discontinuous stratigraphic record dating between A.D. 1100 and 1600. In nine strata Wright found a record of mixed ceramic styles, representing archeological cultures from the south and southeast but not the west. Four ceramic groups identified at Michipicoten include Huron-Petun, Peninsular Woodland, stamped, and push-pull. The Blackduck pottery missing from the Michipicoten sequence was found at the Pic River site west of Michipicoten and at the Montreal River to the south, filling in the regional picture of the complex array of ceramic styles.

Wright asserts that since pottery was not an indigenous part of Ojibwe culture north of Lake Superior, the heterogeneity in style observed in the prehistoric record is explainable through trade/exchange. A cognate of this argument is his interpretation of the lithic industry as highly conservative, showing little variation through time or space. Wright (1968:47-48) believes that this is an indication of local stability in prehistoric Ojibwe material culture. With or without ceramic technology, there is stability in Ojibwe culture. It could be argued that nowhere in the region was ceramic technology indigenous, having diffused from the south. The notion of ceramics being primarily introduced as trade items is not feasible since virtually all ceramics in the region are locally produced from locally available clays (Clark 1991).
Fitting (1975:185) favors Ojibwe as the probable identity of the Juntunen phase based on the faunal remains he interpreted as representing the “Chippewa adaptive pattern”. Stylistic similarities in ceramics, according to Fitting, were the result of influence from interacting Iroquoian groups. Dawson (1982:83) says that the push-pull ceramics are associated with Ottawa and Potawatomi. The distribution of Juntunen ceramics (Figure 9) anticipates the hypothesized eighteenth century westward movement of the Ojibwe on both sides of Lake Superior, and corresponds well to Cleland’s (1992) distribution map of the “Lake Superior Ojibwa”. Juntunen is probably the most significant archeological culture in terms of mapping a prehistoric geographic distribution onto that of the Algonquian groups centered around the Sault in late prehistory, in which are included the Saulteaux, Nipissing, and Ottawa.

Dawson (1982:83) places Mackinac in the Southeastern Algonquian area and groups it geographically with Huron-Petun. The Mackinac wares are considered by him as Saulteaux, while Huron-Petun is Nipissing in affiliation. Juntunen phase pottery, on the other hand, has stylistic affinities with the Ontario Iroquois Middleport and Uren stages of the Lake Huron basin. Juntunen ware includes castellated collars, and extensive use of linear punctuations and the push-pull technique for decoration. Nested chevrons and bands are common motifs (Figure 10).

According to Arthur’s (personal communication 1999)

It is unfortunate that Dawson confused the issue in his early writings by labeling these ceramics Huron-Petun, as most of them are actually what others would classify as Juntunen. In much of his early writings he didn’t recognize that there were non-Iroquoian ceramics that employed traits such as castellated rims or drag-stamped decoration. These traits occur on vessels whose core areas are fairly proximate to the Iroquoian cultures (within their sphere of influence), and to my mind represent imitation of style. In his later writings Dawson suggested a Nipissing (i.e., Algonquian) affiliation, which may account for some, but not all of them.
Figure 10. Juntunen ceramics.
Huron

The evolution of the prehistoric Iroquoian-speakers into their historic counterparts is much better known for the Huron than it is known for their Algonquian or Siouan-speaking neighbors. This is due, in part, to the continuity in geographical setting of the Iroquois groups, and to their early interactions with the French. In particular, the documentation left by the Jesuits is an especially valuable source of information on those aspects of their traditional society usually unavailable in the form of archeological data.

The historic Iroquois are divided into the Saint Lawrence, Five Nation, Erie, Neutral, Susquehannock, Petun, and Huron groups. It is primarily the latter two groups, archeologically collapsed into one, that are relevant to the prehistory and early history of the Lake Superior Basin, although the effects brought about by the wars of the Iroquois and Huron diaspora in the mid-seventeenth century are significant region-wide.

The sedentary Iroquoian groups lived in fortified villages, outside of which were extensive fields where corn, beans, and tobacco were grown. Hunting, fishing, and gathering were practiced but the primary subsistence was based on horticulture (Trigger 1976). Mortuary preference was for ossuary burials, often interred at intervals of seven to ten years at which time all the dead which had accumulated since the last interment were gathered for a large "Feast of the Dead." In addition to the obvious function of disposal of the dead, the accompanying rituals reinforced mutual ties of kinship or acknowledged friendship among both Huron and Algonquian groups. Goods were redistributed and trading partnerships for the following years were negotiated, often facilitating fictive kinship relationships (Hickerson 1960; Trigger 1976).

Prior to 1649, the Northern Division of the Huron-Petun Branch of the Ontario Iroquois Tradition (Wright 1966) was located in an area referred to as Huronia, between northern Lake Huron and Lake Simcoe. Village locations shifted in response to a variety of factors, but overall there was little movement outside of this area except by small, task-specific groups undertaking long-distance trading expeditions. After 1649 when relations with the Five Nation Iroquois forced the Hurons into their historical diaspora across the Great Lakes and into the Mississippi valley, the remnant segments of Huron society took on a modified identity as Wyandots and, with their Ottawa counterparts, continued to practice their trading across the upper lakes. The archeological distribution of Huron pottery in the Lake Superior Basin is spotty but widespread, occurring at the Sault, Michipicoten, Isle Royale, Whitefish Lake, and the Apostle Islands (Figure 11).

Huron pottery is characteristically well fired, thin-walled, and burnished or well smoothed, with distinctive decoration on the rims and necks of vessels (Figure 12). Lines made by incising or by tool impression are most common, although punctates and push-pull continued to be employed. Vessel shapes are round and globular, often with squared collars and/or castellated rims. While Huron pottery is "distinctive," it has been suggested (Fitting 1975; Mason 1976; Ramsden 1988) that what is Huron in style in the Lake Superior region is, in fact, Algonquian mimicry of Huron ceramics. Huron pottery is common on Isle Royale, but not in numbers indicating any more or less activity there than for other non-Iroquoian groups. Dawson (1982:83) considers Huron-Petun ceramics as Nipissing in affiliation, but there is no compelling reason why a certain percentage of these ceramics cannot be Huron or Wyandot from the diaspora of the Huron Confederacy of which the Nipissing were a part.
Figure 11. Geographical distribution of Huron ceramics.
Figure 12. Huron ceramics.
Geographical Distribution of Archeological Cultures

To assess the evidence for multiethnic associations in the Terminal Woodland substage, it is necessary to look at the distribution of various ceramic types across a broad geographical area. In this study, we are concerned with the associations of diagnostic ceramics that may or may not signal patterns of group composition.

Published sources were consulted to investigate the archeological sites in the area focusing on the traditional territory claimed by the Grand Portage Band and more broadly, the Lake Superior Basin. The area includes the north shore of Upper Michigan, the Superior shore of Wisconsin, the Arrowhead region of northern Minnesota as far west as International Falls, and a large portion of northwest Ontario contiguous to Lakes Superior and Nipigon. The nets were cast widely in this area to find a sufficient number of sites for this study.

Archeological data are fraught with problems. Sites, almost never excavated in their entirety, may actually represent the accumulated remains of hundreds of years of occupational history compressed into a few centimeters, and/or spread horizontally over a large area. Consequently, most archeologists keep their distance from the type of interpretation being attempted here. Other bolder individuals, such as Dawson, explain their data in terms of cultural-historical possibilities. Albeit faced with some daunting limitations and caveats, Table 1 expresses what may be considered a “consensus” of cultural affiliation between archeological cultures and their ethnohistoric counterpart.

At the Martin-Bird site on Whitefish Lake (southwest of Thunder Bay), Dawson (1987:54) describes a Terminal Woodland component as “continuous occupation by various carriers of Algonquian culture.” Dawson describes three strata that represent the precontact, initial contact, and historic periods. The site is typical in that the specific associations of ceramic types vary both horizontally and vertically across the site and correlations between these associations and the occupational history of the site may be suspect. However, taken in whole, the site contains Blackduck, Selkirk, Peninsular Woodland, and Mackinac wares, and one Sandy Lake vessel.

Radiocarbon dates range from A.D. 630±85 (dating a Blackduck burial) to A.D. 1775 and the ceramics are in many cases associated with historic trade goods. The ethnic composition in one area of the site is interpreted by Dawson: “The composition of population if it approximates the variations in the ceramic assemblage would be 50% Algonquian speakers out of Michigan and Wisconsin, 25% Ojibwe and 25% Cree. The one Sandy Lake vessel may represent a single fortuitous contact with Siouan-speakers” (1987:56).

Also on Whitefish Lake is the Mound Island site where Dawson (1978) found a major occupation site with Blackduck (52 percent), Mackinac (?) (21 percent), Peninsular Woodland (21 percent), and Pickering Branch (5.2 percent) ceramics. At the McCluskey site, a mainland site on Whitefish Lake, the pattern was Blackduck (90 percent), Selkirk (8 percent), Mackinac, Peninsular Woodland, and Pickering Branch Iroquois (<1 percent each) (Dawson 1974, 1978).

On Isle Royale, Blackduck ceramics occur in equivalent frequencies to both Huron and Juntunen vessels (Blackduck 15 percent, Huron 18 percent, Juntunen 12 percent) but only half of the frequency of Selkirk (32 percent) (Clark 1995). Thirty-nine percent of the Terminal Woodland ceramics were unclassified, reflecting the generic cord-marked pottery of Peninsular Woodland.

Thirty-nine sites in the Superior National Forest in northern Minnesota had diagnostic Terminal Woodland artifacts (typically Blackduck pottery); four also yielded copper artifacts (Peters 1984, 1986; Peters et al. 1983). Most sites found in the forest survey are lithic scatters and surely include a number of aceramic Terminal Woodland components that are not counted here. Excavation by Superior National Forest personnel at the Big Rice Lake site revealed a large occupation with Blackduck and Sandy Lake ceramics (Peters 1984).
Table 1. Correlation Among Archeological Cultures and Their Ethnohistoric Counterparts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Archeological Culture</th>
<th>Linguistic Affiliation</th>
<th>Historic Group</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Blackduck</td>
<td>Algonquian</td>
<td>Menomini, Ojibwe</td>
<td>Dawson 1974, 1975; Wright 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selkirk</td>
<td>Algonquian</td>
<td>Cree</td>
<td>Dawson 1982; MacNeish 1958; Wright 1968</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandy Lake Wattikan</td>
<td>Siouan</td>
<td>Assiniboine</td>
<td>Birk 1977; Cooper and Johnson 1964; this report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mackinac</td>
<td>Algonquian</td>
<td>Saulteaux, Ojibwe</td>
<td>Dawson 1982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juntunen</td>
<td>Algonquian</td>
<td>Ottawa, Potawattomi</td>
<td>Dawson 1977, 1982; McPherron 1967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juntunen</td>
<td>Algonquian</td>
<td>Saulteaux, Ojibwe</td>
<td>Fitting 1975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juntunen</td>
<td>Iroquoian</td>
<td>Iroquoian</td>
<td>McPherron 1967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juntunen</td>
<td>Algonquian</td>
<td>Ottawa or Ottawa/Saulteaux mix</td>
<td>This report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huron</td>
<td>Iroquoian</td>
<td>Huron</td>
<td>This report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huron-Petun</td>
<td>Algonquian</td>
<td>Nipissing</td>
<td>Dawson 1982; Fitting 1975; Mason 1976; Ramsden 1988</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In a survey of sites at Voyageurs National Park on the international border, including Rainy, Namakan, and Kabetogama Lakes, Blackduck is reported as the most common (Lynn et al. 1986). Blackduck is associated with Selkirk at eight sites, and with Sandy Lake at two. There is one site with only Blackduck and one with only Selkirk. The nearby Long Sault site on the Rainy River was intensively excavated and produced evidence for a Blackduck and Selkirk habitation and burial site of long duration (Arthurs 1986). Rajnovich (1980) reported eleven Terminal Woodland sites with Blackduck pottery from the north shore of Rainy Lake. Kenyon (1986) describes several burial mound sites in northwestern Ontario, many on the Rainy River. Kenyon defines the ceramics in them as being exclusively Blackduck, whereas Arthurs (personal communication 1990) feels they are exclusively Selkirk. The exclusivity in itself is noteworthy in view of the typical heterogeneity of ceramics on occupation sites.

The Ballynaacree site in the Lake of the Woods area was a Blackduck, Selkirk, and Sandy Lake occupation (Rajnovich and Reid 1987). Also near Kenora, the Ballysadare site produced Blackduck ceramics, apparently without any other Terminal Woodland types (Rajnovich 1980). The Spruce Point site at the north end of the Lake of the Woods also had late prehistoric occupations identified by the presence of Blackduck, Sandy Lake, and Selkirk ceramics (Rajnovich 1983).

The West Patricia District of northwestern Ontario covers 223,500 square kilometers (86,300 square miles) of rivers and lakes of the southern boreal forest. The extensive survey of this area disclosed approximately 264 Terminal Woodland sites (Reid 1980; Reid and Ross 1981; Ross 1982). In most cases, the components are identified as Blackduck and/or Selkirk.

The Cabinosh Island site is located on the north shore of that island at the eastern end of the Nipigon Bay archipelago in Lake Superior. According to David Arthurs (personal communication 1990), the site is stratified and includes Heins Creek, Madison, Mackinac, Juntunen, Blackduck, Selkirk (?), and Iroquoian ceramics.
The Michipicoten site at the mouth of the Michipicoten River on Lake Superior contains stratified deposits ranging from A.D. 1100 to 1700 (J.V. Wright 1968). Stratum VII (ca. A.D. 1100-1400) contained Juntunen and Peninsular Woodland ceramics. Stratum III (ca. A.D. 1460) contained Huron, Juntunen, and Peninsular Woodland ceramics. Stratum II (ca. A.D. 1700) contained Huron, Juntunen, and Peninsular Woodland ceramics. This sequence and other similar ones may be interpreted as a reflection of over 600 years of regional stability with the later addition of Huron/Nipissing ceramics.

The Whitefish Island site at Sault Ste. Marie produced an assemblage duplicating the association of ceramic wares seen at Michipicoten and at several Isle Royale sites. Conway (1977) describes the association with Huron, Mackinac, Bois Blanc, Juntunen, Blackduck, and Algoma style ceramics. (“Algoma” ceramics represent Conway’s interpretation of a local Algonquian ceramic tradition. It has not been formally published or described, however.)

On the Keweenaw Peninsula in the Upper Peninsula’s copper range and to the southwest toward the Wisconsin border, archeological sites take on expected similarities comparable to Isle Royale and north shore sites, although they reflect a southern “Chippewa” or Sauilteaux orientation. The Sand Point site at the southern end of Keweenaw Bay is dated between A.D. 1100-1400 with a ceramic complex related to the Lakes phase of northern Wisconsin and stylistic ties to the Juntunen phase (Claire McHale Milner, personal communication 1989). The site includes eleven burial mounds, and the remains of a minimum of 117 individuals were recovered from site testing (Cremin 1980). At the Montreal River site near the tip of the Keweenaw Peninsula, the assemblage is dominated by Mero phase grit-tempered Oneota ceramics and includes Sand Point and Juntunen ware.

The Juntunen site at the Straits of Mackinac, a pivotal site in a regional crossroads, was discussed earlier. Suffice to say that the diversity of ceramics here indicates a complex occupational history of large seasonal aggregations of mostly Algonquian-speakers come together for the fishing, the feasting, and the burial of their dead. It is important to observe that the overall composition of the Juntunen ceramic assemblage, especially in its later prehistoric occupations, appears to mirror that of many of the major sites along the north shore of Lake Superior: Michipicoten, Pic River, the Thunder Bay area, Whitefish Lake, and Isle Royale.

Discussion

In general, we can conclude from the overview of Terminal Woodland archeological cultures that, apart from marked differences in ceramic styles, the settlement and subsistence practices of Great Lakes Terminal Woodland peoples were very similar. We have already seen from Dawson’s proportional representation of different ceramic traditions at individual sites that a number of pots, representing a number of archeological cultures, are typically present at individual sites. This leaves open the question of how they came to be at the same site and what this means in terms of mobility, manufacture, and group composition.

Using Isle Royale as a focal point, a study of trace elements in ceramics selected from sites all around the Lake Superior Basin indicated that pottery was both imported to and locally manufactured on Isle Royale (Clark et al. 1992). The best evidence for long-distance movement of pots was found in the Juntunen phase; the vessels stylistically belonged to the eastern end of Lake Superior and the Straits of Mackinac, but were made with clays found on Isle Royale. If one discounts ceramics as a possible commodity, there is no conclusive archeological evidence for trade or exchange with neighboring areas within the Lake Superior basin. Even in the event that ceramics were traded, the evidence is largely restricted to the Juntunen phase. In this case, mobility of Juntunen potters between the Straits of Mackinac and Isle Royale along the north shore seems an equally valid explanation. That Blackduck and Selkirk co-occur in such frequency reflects an ongoing use of the north shore by people already familiar with the western end of Lake Superior, whether or not one ascribes to the theory that they are coeval or that one supplants the other through time.
The Selkirk/Blackduck association is documented at least as early as about A.D. 1000. It appears commonplace in the archaeological record 200 years later, and persists at least until contact in the seventeenth century. Valid questions regarding this association include why an apparent association of two reasonably discrete ceramic styles over a period of 700 years did not evolve into a stylistic hybrid. Perhaps the answer is in coreidence and the maintenance of cultural identity through time, rather than a situation of hybridization and change.

A stylistic trend noted by Lugenbeal (1978) does hint that hybridization may have been under way. At the Smith site in northern Minnesota early Blackduck surface treatment of cord-marking gave way in later times to fabric impressions, both overlain by similar applications of cord-wrapped cord, punctuations, and brushing. If this trend is valid, it may indicate a shift in orientation of some type from the southern cord-marked traditions of the Peninsular Woodland to the fabric impressed pottery of Selkirk. By extension, this may signal the increasing cultural alignment with the Cree and the formation of the historic Cree-Ojibwe.

Actually, Peninsular Woodland and its various relations represent a "wild card" in this study. With the general agreement that it represents an Algonquian cultural phenomenon that appears on both sides of Lake Superior and to the south beginning around A.D. 700, there is a possibility, if not a probability, it represents another pre-Ojibwe archaeological culture. Arthurs (personal communication 1999) utilizes the northern Lake Michigan ceramic type Heins Creek as the expression of Peninsular Woodland he views as prevalent in the Lake Superior north shore chronology. He sees pottery with stylistic similarities to Heins Creek appearing on sites around A.D. 700, followed by Mackinac, Juntunen, and other types reminiscent of Oneota and Iroquoian wares. These he interprets as the product of "successive waves of expansion across the north shore from centers farther and farther to the south and east." Arthurs attributes the appearance of these exotic ceramics to incursions by small trading parties into the area, to rendezvous with boreal forest groups (i.e., Blackduck and Selkirk) from the local area and from points farther to the north and west.

What Arthurs postulates is not inconsistent with the basic hypothesis of this study: that archaeological cultures anticipating the historic Ojibwe were present around the Lake Superior for centuries prior to European contact. The challenge is one of reconciliation between the various interpretations of the relationship, both chronological and sociocultural, among the Peninsular Woodland and the other contemporaneous Algonquian archaeological cultures of the region.

Chronology is poorly controlled with respect to the fine-tuning of ceramic traditions. An updated classification of Blackduck (Lugenbeal 1978), Selkirk (Rajnovich 1988), and Juntunen ceramics (McHale Miner and O'Shea 1990) has begun to refine the traditional definition of ceramic styles, but the fundamental problem of relating these parts to a panregional whole remains. Clearly, the very general approach to chronology that characterizes most archaeological analysis, in which the entire Terminal Woodland substage is treated as a single entity, greatly oversimplifies the issue of group composition and interaction which occurred in prehistory. However, the requirements of the data to treat the historical realities of ethnic identity cannot be fully met by the existing archaeological record. A large portion of the chronological uncertainty stems from the spotty documentation of archeology along both the south and the north shore of Lake Superior. Conway's "Algoma" pottery (1977) and perhaps other undocumented archeological cultures between Lake Nipigon and the Sault may have influenced the direction and scope of composition and interaction in the region in both spatial and temporal terms.

The degree of inclusiveness/exclusiveness in ceramics in a regional pattern of archeological sites should constitute the index of potential if not actual group composition. Discounting for the moment all of the alternative explanations mentioned earlier (marriage practices, raiding, warfare, mimicry, trade, and exchange), the potential for mixed group composition requires further consideration. The association of Blackduck and Selkirk ceramics does not require any of these vehicles to account for their co-occurrence on individual sites or across the region as a whole, since they represent closely related cultural phenomena associated in space, time, and by the sharing of fundamentally similar adaptive strategies and cultural values. The operative unit
responsible for depositing the archeological remains may have been something as small as a single family or as large as multiclans village. Membership was likely fluid, potentially representing elements of any or all members of the archeological cultures in a region.

The pervasive problem of organizing the "chaos" of the cord-marked ceramics of the Upper Great Lakes may be a function of the band-band composite situation over time that has two important characteristics: 1) general similarities in style over a large area, and 2) sufficient discreetness to give the impression that to the archeologist, real "types" exist. As we have seen, using proportions of ceramic styles Dawson (1982) generated a series of cultural-historical "just-so" stories to account for the archeological record. This is a function of a one-pot, one-culture view and represents little possibility of trade, exchange, multiethnic groupings, etc., to explain the variability. Still, the distribution and proportions of style, a la Dawson, are thought provoking on a geographic level, chronology, and sampling notwithstanding.

Other factors influencing the formation of the archeological record include issues of settlement and seasonality that undoubtedly conditioned the best time of year to visit a site, and the number of people that could reasonably camp there. In a "good place to camp," such as a logistically important river mouth or sheltered bay, at a place of resource abundance, or at a place of spiritual significance, the likelihood of many visits over a long period of time is high. The habitual problem of discerning small repeated occupations by small groups from single occupations by large ones can only be acknowledged, but not effectively addressed in a study of this nature. Any of these variables, singly or in combination, would explain the presence of more than one ceramic style on a single site.

In this regard, Grand Portage, which lacks any significant evidence of a Terminal Woodland occupation, was likely not the primary point of departure for groups traveling to and from Isle Royale, nor the destination of groups coming from the east or west. Although Grand Portage is one of the best sheltered bays south of the Canadian border, the mouth of the Pigeon River/Pigeon Bay, Pigeon Point, and Waswagoning Bay probably were the focus of occupation prior to the advent of the fur trade as the only nearby locations for spawning whitefish and lake sturgeon. Unfortunately, we have no archeological evidence to support this.

**Ethnohistoric Cultures**

It is necessary to define what is meant by the term "Ojibwe" since this forms the living corollary of archeological cultures. Of primary concern is the identification of a specific group at a specific place at a specific time, which is easier said than done.

**What is an Ethnohistoric Culture?**

Social relationships in an historic setting, rather than archeology's relationships of material objects in a hypothetical setting, are the basis for defining ethnohistoric cultures. Using historical records, groups are observed in their living context, albeit often through strongly biased glasses. Ranging from mere footnotes in a traveler's journal to detailed descriptions made by captives, priests, or traders these are often the only windows into a cultural past that illuminate a cultural complexity largely invisible to archeology. It is at once challenging and confusing when confronted by a name that appears in one place one year and hundreds of miles away another, with no clear understanding of the mechanism that made that move necessary, or for that matter, what exactly that name signifies. In this section, we will seek an operating definition of the Ojibwe.

**Who are the Ojibwe?**

The Ojibwe are part of a vast group of Algonquian-speaking people found from the Atlantic coast, through the Great Lakes and the Northern Plains. The Central Algonquian language group includes Ojibwe (the language) with variations in dialect that are or were spoken by the Northern Ojibwe, Ottawa, Mississauga, Nipissing, Potawatomi, and Algonquin (Goddard 1978). Rhodes and Todd (1981:54) place Grand Portage in the Northwestern Ojibwe dialect group that runs from south of Grand Portage west to Rainy Lake and north from
Grand Portage almost to the Nipigon River. From here it extends north and west to Lake Winnipeg, forming a wedge between the Saulteaux dialect group to the west, the Severn dialect to the north, and the Central Ojibwe dialect to the east. Linguistically, the Grand Portage Band area falls in the extreme south end of a large dialect group with its closest affinities to the northwest.

According to their own history, there were five original Ojibwe clans which grew to twenty-two. The four primary clans of the Grand Portage Band included the Moose, Marten, Caribou, and Pike clans. This system defined kinship relations and marriage rules, as well as providing an identity for band members that linked them to other bands. Clan membership is determined through the male line and marriage could not take place between clan members. "Children, always members of their father's clan, were taught to ask first for a person's clan, then for his parents' names, and last for his own name" (Grand Portage Band of Chippewa 1983:7). Cameron (1960:247) noted that

All those who are of the same mark or atem consider themselves as relations, even if they or their forefathers never had any connexion with each other, or had seen one another before. When two strangers meet and find themselves to be of the same mark, they immediately begin to trace their genealogy, at which they even beat my countrymen, the Highlanders, and the one becomes a cousin, the uncle or the grand father of the other, although the grand father may often be the youngest of the two. It is not an uncommon thing to hear an Indian speak of twelve grandfathers and as many grand mothers.

As we will see, the ability to identify oneself as a band member and as a clan member had tangible advantages where seasonal resource availability was concerned.

Ojibwe origin accounts place the Ojibwe people at the mouth of the St. Lawrence River, moving in the 1500s to a location north of Lake Huron and at the east end of Lake Superior. By the 1600s, the Ojibwe had moved west along the south shore of Lake Superior displacing Siouan groups in Michigan's Upper Peninsula and northern Wisconsin. During the latter half of the seventeenth century, movement further westward took place on both sides of Lake Superior, all the way to Fond du Lac.

At the same time, [1600s] other Chippewa bands moved west along the north shore of Lake Superior. The northern Chippewa had strong ties with the Cree and took their side in the war with the Dakota. But the Chippewa at Fond du Lac exchanged peaceful visits with the Dakota at Mille Lacs for a while. And the Chippewa on both sides of the lake were mostly neutral [Grand Portage Band of Chippewa 1983:11].

In 1727, the French entered into direct trade with the Dakota, eliminating Ojibwe middlemen and creating animosity with the latter. Warfare between Ojibwe and Dakota started in earnest and resulted in a southern displacement of Dakota to south and west. The Ojibwe occupied Mille Lacs in about 1745, after the defeat of the Dakota village there (Grand Portage Band of Chippewa 1983:12). Small-scale conflicts with the Dakota continued into the mid 1800s.

In correspondence dating October 12, 1742, there is evidence of both the warfare against the Sioux and the identity of Grand Portage as a political entity:

Father Coquart, who has returned from the post of Kamamiwigouia, writes me in the 9th of last month, that while the Sieur de la Venerendry’s people were at the grand portage, the Sautéou of that post came there to hold a council with a Savage Chief of that Place, a very influential man; That last Spring that Chief told him he had determined to strike a blow at the Sciuou [Thwaites 1899-1900].

Woolworth (1998:2) citing La Verendrye, notes that in 1741 an alliance was formed against the Sioux among the Grand Portage, Lake Nipigon, Kamamiwigouia, Tekamamioune (Rainy Lake), Ojibve (?), Monsoms, Christineau (Cree) and Assininboine tribes, under the leadership of a Grand Portage chief. It is curious that in
this listing the Ojibwe are differentiated from other "Ojibwe" groups. Earlier, in 1669-1670, Dablon (quoted by Hickerson 1974:32) lists the Saulters distinct from the Ootchibous.

The distribution and identity of neighboring bands around Grand Portage tell us something of its history and composition. For example, at various points in history the Grand Portage Band is differentiated from the Kaministiquia Band while at other times they are combined. There are four major bands of concern here: Grand Portage, Nipigon, Rainy Lake, and Fond du Lac. According to Tim Cochrane (personal communication 1998), the Nipigon, Rainy Lake, and Fond du Lac bands were bigger and more politically powerful than the Grand Portage Band. Among these, the Grand Portage Band is probably located in the area poorest in natural resources but managed to maintain autonomy through its logistical situation at the head of the Northwest Company's portage. A redundant and resource-poor shoreline of rocky bar river mouths and headlands to the south created a buffer between these Northern Ojibwe and Fond du Lac, between which there was little interaction or movement. Grand Portage Bay is the southernmost of several good, sheltered bays but offers the shortest overland route to navigable portions of the Pigeon River, which was probably the basis for its selection by the Northwest Company and earlier French and British traders. Since the Jesuits typically looked for a population base upon which to focus their activities, it was probably the Pigeon River where the Jesuits established their first point of contact with the local inhabitants.

It is apparent that the Sault was not the only place to find people called Ojibwe. Writing in 1804-1805 in "A Sketch of the Customs, Manners, Way of Living of the Natives in the Barren Country About Nipigon" M. Duncan Cameron (1960:241) stated:

This part of the country has been peopled about one hundred and fifty years ago [ca. 1650], partly from Lake Superior and partly from Hudson's Bay, as it would evidently appear from the language of the Natives, which is a mixture of the Ojibotay, or Chippeway [f.n. Saulters] as some call it, spoken at Lake Superior and the Cree or Masquigon spoken at Hudson's Bay.

Every old man with whom I conversed, and from whom I made some enquiry on this subject, told me that his father or grand father was from either of these two places, and that the reason they came so far back could be accounted for in no other way than in the following: Population was then on the increase both in Hudson's Bay and on the shores of Lake Superior, and as Indians, who are obliged to rove from place to place for a good hunting ground, are equally at home in any place where they can find their living, they took to the interior of the country where they found innumerable rivers and lakes, swarming with a vast quantity of fish, beaver and otters. When one place was exhausted, they would retire farther and farther back till these two people, who are undoubtedly of the same origin, began to meet one another in the interior and to intermarry by which they, at length became one people.

While perhaps anecdotal, Cameron's account "explains" the fusion of the Cree and Ojibwe as a function of mobility and proximity. Traditional subsistence practices would have certainly fostered a gradual process of cultural integration.

**Ojibwe Subsistence and Settlement**

Subsistence and settlement refer to the way in which people utilize resources for survival and how they distribute themselves on the landscape. Most resources are seasonally available and where they occur in large numbers, permit the coming together of large groups of people. The corollary is that in seasons of food scarcity or of dispersal of resources, people will tend also to be dispersed. The basic pattern of subsistence follows the seasonal round of resource availability.

The spring was a time of coming together for the spawning runs of suckers and sturgeon at river mouths on Lake Superior and the larger interior lakes. It was also the time for harvesting the incoming flight of passenger pigeons arriving from the south. Summer was a period of resource abundance with many options, including
beaver, moose, caribou, and deer hunting, fishing, and berry collecting. Group size could vary widely and mobility was at its peak as canoe travel made all the islands, rivers, and lakes the highway of the people. Another major fish run occurred in fall as trout and whitefish sought out their spawning grounds and large numbers of people gathered at the river mouths on Lake Superior for the last time of the year for this harvest. Fall brought the harvest of wild rice for those with access to this important crop. The western portion of the Grand Portage Band territory touches upon the “rice district” and provided a storable resource that would, along with preserved fish, meat, and berries, provide a savings account for winter survival when the availability of food was least secure. As game fattened and coats thickened in anticipation of winter, attention returned to hunting, and the hunters and their families dispersed to their interior camps. Winter was a period of relative isolation and limited mobility, occasionally ending in a lean period broken by temperatures allowing the sap of the maple tree to be collected and rendered into life-saving sugar. Maple sugaring over a period of many years could have led to a strong identity of families to their traditional sugar bush, and by extension, to a seasonal resource-based territoriality.

While the availability and distribution of food resources is paramount in its importance, other factors influenced the settlement and subsistence patterns. Human needs other than eating had to be met. It was during the periods of abundance that information regarding the distribution of game, enemies, and friends, and the prognosis of a rice harvest or fish run could be learned. Feasting and rituals reinforcing the community, marriage, burial of the dead, and exchange of gifts took place during these times, and important plans of future movements were made.

Another very important dimension is one of reciprocal relations among band members. The sharing of resources was a network of security that could be counted on at any time of the year. Special relationships based on kin or clan membership could often mean the difference between life and death, especially during the lean months of winter and early spring. If a family had located in an area where there was no game, it could move to another area where, based on information learned from the fall gathering, relations could be found. Wintering on Isle Royale may have been a greater risk since the decision to stay on the island would have been irrevocable after the onset of storms and ice, and would have been without recourse to reciprocal security.

**History and the Ojibwe Name**

When considering the question of “who are the Ojibwe,” we need also to ask, “what is Ojibwe” since we are not only dealing with a living group of people, but with the name itself which, as we shall see, has its own history in time and space, including a variety of usages. At the outset, we must acknowledge an important caveat:

Without a clear understanding of the historical usage of “tribal” designations such as “Cree” and “Ojibwa” (or, for that matter, “Ottawa,” “Algonquin,” “Montagnais,” “Naskapi,” etc.), attempts to classify the supposed antecedents of contemporary native populations often lead to mistaken theories of population movement, or to false impressions of either homogeneity or discreteness of culture [Greenberg and Morrison 1982:92].

Schenck’s (1997) brief but succinct treatment of historic names identifies the earliest name that can be reliably linked to the southern Ojibwe as Sauteur (alternate spellings include Sauteur and Sauteaux). The name was in more or less general use by the French throughout the seventeenth century, and referred to the principal residence at Sault Ste. Marie (Schenck 1997:17-18). The Sauteur were first contacted by Jesuits in 1642 as participants in the Feast of the Dead, which was hosted by the Nipissing on Lake Huron. A subsequent visit by the priests to the Sault found about 2,000 people engaged in fall fishing (Schenck 1997:18-19). Schenck (1997:19) cites Father Jean Claude Allouez who, writing in 1667, referred to a group called the Outchibous. In 1670 he differentiated the Sauteur from the Outchibous that he placed north of the Sault. Schenck concluded that, “the true name for those people who resided at Sault Ste. Marie in the 17th century was Ojibwa” (1997:20). I will not make an argument for or against Schenck’s conclusion, although I admit to having some misgivings about “the true name” for any group in this vastly complicated situation. I believe that the
distinction made by Allouez and Dablon differentiating the Sauteur from the Outhibous is most telling and likely represents an ancient distinction later obscured by historic movement and reorganization.

It is apparent that the historical treatment of names ranges from inclusive to exclusive, and that the geographical placement of those groups to whom the name is applied shifts through time. Exclusivity seems to be limited to earlier usage where Ojibwe is used to differentiate one group from another that in later times would be subsumed by the term. In its inclusive mode, *Ojibwe* contained large numbers of smaller Algonquian groups such as the Mississauga, Amikwa, Nipissing, Noquet, and Nikikouek (Schenck 1997:17).

The term eventually embraced additional Northern Ojibwe groups to the north and west of Lake Superior. Greenberg and Morrison (1982) present a convincing argument regarding the westward spread of the name *Ojibwe* and the relationship between the Ojibwe and Cree. They assert that as the Northern Ojibwe had occupied the boreal forest north of Lake Superior at least since European contact, and that the name *Ojibwe* diffused west it came to include the Monsoni, Muskego, Gens des Terres, and Cree. They further argue that the "blanket tribal designation like 'Cree' or 'Ojibwa' has created a false impression of cultural homogeneity or discreteness, disguising local and ecological and social variability in ethnic categories" (1982:76). In summary, they suggest that the Northern Ojibwe began as groups of hunters who spoke an Ojibwe/Cree dialect. Sometime around (or before) contact, some of these groups began to visit the Sault to fish, trade, marry, etc., returning to the interior hunting grounds in the winter months. With the beginning of the Iroquois depredations, these northerners ceased their visits and, according to Greenberg and Morrison, became divided from the Saulteaux or Southern Ojibwe. The "Northern Ojibwe," which were Ojibwe-Cree or Cree in origin, became the Ojibwe of history as a result of ethnographic confusion. Greenberg and Morrison offer the term "Boreal Forest Cree-Ojibwe" as a more accurate, if more cumbersome name.

**Regional Historical Context**

The acquisition of European material culture preceded the arrival of the first whites in the Upper Great Lakes, filtering through a down-the-line exchange network extending from the St. Lawrence River across the Great Lakes to the Mississippi Valley (Table 2 has been provided for easy reference to the historical events and processes only touched upon in the discussion that follows). There is no consensus regarding the extent and magnitude of sociocultural change brought on by contact and the fur trade. Fundamental broad-scale shifts in native culture have been postulated, including an increase in the incidence of intergroup hostility. Traditional historical interpretations of the impact of the fur trade on native cultures suggest that low-level endemic warfare, often drawn along linguistic boundaries, reflected the reciprocal animosity among groups and served as a means to acquire personal prestige. Blood feuds required exchanges in which redress and compensation were the ultimate goal. But by the mid-1600s the motivation for violent interaction, even if founded on traditional blood feud idioms, was directed toward the acquisition of furs, fur bearing territories, and/or an economically strategic position as middlemen between the French and native groups lacking direct access to them.

We know from the study of prehistory that settlement and subsistence did not remain static. It evolved as the climate, the landscape, and the ethnic and social make-up of the human population changed through time. Technologies permitting more effective harvesting of fish allowing even greater seasonal aggregations of people and a surplus of storable food to better buffer the winter scarcity.

The advent of the fur trade and its impact on native culture has been hotly debated, some asserting that it disrupted and destroyed native practices, others that it was simply grafted onto a native system. A revisionist interpretation stresses the lack of impact by the fur trade and European culture in general on native society and the longevity of traditional practices. Trends already underway, including dispersals due to local overpopulation, and hypothesized shifts towards larger clan based villages, may have been amplified by the coming of the whites (Cleland 1992; Fitting 1975; Schenck 1997).
That change occurred is undeniable and it is beyond the scope of this project to address this issue. Bruce Trigger presents a plausible middle ground in the debate, worthy of mention; although his argument pertains more directly to the Huron, it has general applicability to the Algonquians as well. The adoption of tools of European manufacture has been referred to as a "dependency." Whether sudden or gradual, the replacement of traditional tools to those acquired through trade "developed because native peoples clearly recognized that the possession of certain classes of European goods made life easier and more secure for them. Once they became familiar with the range of good that the Europeans had to offer, they sought to obtain items of considerable technological value" (Trigger 1981:24).

The participation in the fur trade was a means to make life easier, more convenient, and more pleasurable. The shifts in traditional lifeways were not dramatic changes, but adjustments to an ancient system of seasonal movements, and a seasonal redirection of effort towards fur-bearers rather than meat producers. It was now necessary to bring the winter’s furs to the depot to obtain goods in the spring, and to obtain the necessary supplies in the fall to insure a good harvest of pelts. This may account for Woolworth’s (1998:73) statement that, "In early historic times [prior to 1805], the Ojibwe Indian winter village was at the east end of Grand Portage Bay where Mount Josephine sheltered it from the harsh winter winds." This is contrary to the typical pattern of winter dispersal of small family groups in the interior away from Lake Superior, but may reflect a new settlement type as a point of contact with the traders. In addition, it provided the context for the coming together of a diverse mix of native and non-native cultures.

By the mid-seventeenth century Neutral and Five Nation Iroquois attacks on the Algonquian speakers in southwestern Ontario and Michigan’s Lower Peninsula caused the Sault, Fox, Kickapoo, Mascouten, Miami, and Potowatomis to move west of Lake Michigan, leaving the land between lakes Huron and Michigan virtually uninhabited. It was also during this period, between the 1660s and 1690s, that the French increased their presence in the Upper Great Lakes with the building of missions, forts, and trading centers. Changing social configurations found the development of multi-ethnic populations around the social and economic nuclei of these French establishments (Mason 1981; Quinby 1966; Ray 1974).

Apart from proselytizing the faith, the exploration of the Upper Country was strictly a means to an end: the discovery of the route that would open direct trade between Europe, Cathay, and Japan. Eventually, the region came to be appreciated on its own merits by Europeans who sought to exploit its vast resources rather than merely use the land as a base for seeking a waterway through to the continent to the fabled La Mer de l’Ouest. As French and Spanish commercial interest in the interior of the North American continent increased, the eighteenth century witnessed fierce mercantile and military competition between the British and the French. French control of the St. Lawrence waterway and the Great Lakes region ended with the military defeat of the French and the signing of the Treaty of Paris in 1763 that ceded that vast region to Great Britain. With the French eliminated as a political power in North America, British and Canadian merchants vigorously exploited the fur resources of the interior, aided by a workforce of largely Indian, French, and French-Canadian extraction.

On August 26, 1731 the French trader, La Verendrye, arrived at Grand Portage Bay. A few men were sent on to Rainy Lake where they established Fort St. Pierre. Most of La Verendrye’s party retreated to Thunder Bay for the winter, returning to Grand Portage the following year. They continued west that summer to establish Fort St. Charles at the Lake of the Woods. Although never a post as such, Grand Portage was probably traversed regularly by French traders until the area fell into British hands at the conclusion of the French and Indian Wars.

In about 1768, John Erskine (Akin) put up a stockade and post at east end of the portage. A merger of several trading partners in Montreal was effected in 1783, and the North West Company was born. For a time, Fort Michilimackinac at the northern tip of Michigan’s Lower Peninsula was the western outlier of the fur trade and its voyageurs could make the trip between there and Montreal within the scope of a single ice-free season. As
the trade moved west and the distance lengthened, a second administrative center was established at Grand Portage. Here was the depot where the great cargo canoes and bateau of the Great Lakes exchanged their westbound loads of trade goods for eastbound bales of castor gras, arriving in the lighter and smaller canoes of the inland waterways of the west.

A substantial post was built on the shores of Grand Portage Bay. In the 1790s, the depot consisted of 16 buildings surrounded by a log stockade. The waterfront included wharves and a dock capable of accommodating the 75-ton schooner Otter. It was also at this time that Fort Charlotte was constructed at the western end of the portage on the Pigeon River. A second and smaller post was built by the competing XY Company on the opposite side of Grand Portage Creek from the North West Company's facilities. The XY Company operated between 1797 and 1805 until bought out by its stronger neighbor.

A decision to move the great depot to British territory was made during the meeting of the North West Company at Grand Portage in 1798, after a land survey disclosed that the depot lay on American soil. Negotiations were made with local Ojibwe bands at Thunder Bay and Grand Portage in the late summer of 1798 to purchase land along the Kaministiquia River (Woolworth 1998:65). Construction of the new post, called Fort William, began in 1802 and the Grand Portage facility was abandoned two years later.

After the move to Thunder Bay the Ojibwe and Metis population which remained at Grand Portage continued to exploit Isle Royale's resources and, in 1836 when the American Fur Company expanded its operations to include commercial fishing, were much sought after for their knowledge and expertise in the local fishery (Cochrane n.d.). Ojibwe men and women were employed by the American Fur Company at Grand Portage and other sites (Franchere 1839). The men engaged in fishing, the women in processing the catch. Archeological remains of American Fur Company establishments on Isle Royale have been identified at Grace Point, the head of Siskwit Bay, Checker Point, at Belle Isle, and at the Siskowit Mine. Most of the American Fur Company fishing establishments on Isle Royale coincided with earlier prehistoric sites and, after the termination of American Fur Company fishing in 1841; these sites were reoccupied by native families. In 1846-1847 surveyor Charles Ives reported the location of an Indian maple sugaring camp on Red Oak Ridge or Sugar Mountain near the Island Mine. Sarah Barr Christian's diary relates a trip she made to a sugaring camp "on the north side of the island" (Christian 1932). Ives notes other Indian camps at Merritt Lane, Grace Point, Grace Island, Siskowit Mine, and at the mouth of Washington Creek (Ives 1846-1847).

The Grand Portage Community

The historic documentation of the number of Indians at Grand Portage throughout the span of the fur trade post there is poor. Even though Grand Portage census information is available from 1831 on, it must be remembered that the community also included those families occupying places such as Basswood and Saganaga Lakes at some distance from Grand Portage Bay which were likely omitted from the censuses. Hickerson's research in a lands claim case (1974) states that there was no Ojibwe village at Grand Portage prior to the trade. In fact, he states (1974:147) that, "There are no records of the existence of a Chippewa village at Grand Portage before 1800." Woolworth (personal communication 1999) believes that a village originated here in the 1730s and was located near Mount Josephine at the eastern end of Grand Portage Bay; here the village would have been sheltered from the winds off Lake Superior.

Following the depot's move to Thunder Bay, the numbers of native residents remained small. "In 1831, Henry R. Schoolcraft, U.S. Indian Agent at Sault Ste. Marie, said there were only twelve men, eleven women, and twenty-seven children in the village of Grand Portage" (Grand Portage Band 1983:59). In 1834, American Fur Company's Ramsay Crooks hired about twenty Grand Portage residents to fish between the Pigeon River and Grand Marais. The fishery was closed in 1842 due to a poor market. Schoolcraft's census figures are substantially lower than subsequent ones. He did not actually visit Grand Portage and likely underrepresented the total number of persons living within the band territory. Even the season of the year in which a census was
taken could substantially influence the numbers since the amount of dispersal and aggregation depended on the availability of specific resources.

The years of 1840–1842 were poor ones for the Grand Portage Band who went to La Pointe to plead for hunting gear and supplies. They maintained a loyalty to British trade and were reluctant to trade with the American Fur Company. In the spring of 1842, Fr. Pierre set up his mission at the mouth of the Pigeon River, where he encouraged the practice of agriculture and husbandry. He did not linger and there was no priest until 1848.

The 1854 Treaty of La Pointe included the cession of lands from Duluth to the international border, setting aside two reserves at Fond du Lac and Grand Portage. According to Hickerson (1974:2-3), there were three distinct groups of Ojibwe in northeastern Minnesota (“Area 332”) as signatories of the treaty. These were “politically distinct from each other—they never combined for any activity, economic, social, political, or ceremonial. The three villages, or bands, of Chippewas living in Area 332 were called in the treaty document Grand Portage Band (4 signers), Fond du Lac Band (14 signers), and Bois Forte Band (3 signers)” (Hickerson 1974:2-3).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date (A.D.)</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>700-1400</td>
<td>Widespread co-occurrence of Terminal Woodland ceramic types throughout the Lake Superior Basin.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1400-1750</td>
<td>Sandy Lake pottery appears with Blackduck and Selkirk wares.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1641-1642</td>
<td>Jerome Laflamme wrote that the Saulteau were located at Sault Ste. Marie and the Sioux were 18 days travel from Sault Ste. Marie; probably the Mississippi headwaters.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1665-1666</td>
<td>Allouez founds mission at Chequamegon among Huron and Ottawa refugees from Iroquois wars.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1667</td>
<td>Allouez refers to a group called the Oatchibone.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1669-1670</td>
<td>Dablon places the Sioux eight days west of Chequamegon.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1670</td>
<td>Allouez differentiates between the Oatchibone who are located north of the Sault, and the Saulteur.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1676</td>
<td>Radin map shows the Sioux living between the west end of Lake Superior and the Mississippi (Riviere Baud).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1679-1680</td>
<td>According to Duluth, the Ojibwe are attempting to extend their hunting lands to the west from the Sault. Peace council held at Fond du Lac (?) among the Cree, Ojibwe, Sioux, and Assiniboine. Peaceful relations lasted until 1736.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1680-</td>
<td>Hypothesized period of westward migration of Saulteaux.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1682</td>
<td>La Salle states that the Saulteaux actively trading with the Sioux in the Mississippi headwaters area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1695</td>
<td>The trader La Chesnyay states that the Ojibwe were living as far west as Pic River, Cree at Lake Nipigon, Cree and Assiniboine at the Kamativiquia River.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1720-1730</td>
<td>La Verendrye explores west of Lake Superior, Pigeon River, Rainy Lake. Reports that the Indians at Kamativiquia River were Cree, Monsonis, and Assiniboine.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1725</td>
<td>French enter into direct trade with the Sioux, eliminating the Ojibwe as intermediaries.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ca. 1730–1746</td>
<td>First evidence of the Grand Portage Band as a discrete entity as signatories on treaties and in historical documentation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1756</td>
<td>Alliance broken; war opens between Sioux and Cree; Ojibwe shift alliance from Sioux to Cree and Assiniboine.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1736–1776</td>
<td>Characterized by Hickerson as a period of warfare with changes in tribal use and occupancy (i.e., expansion) in the region northwest of Lake Superior; places the Ojibwe (“Saulteaux”) at the mouth of the Kamativiquia River in 1744 and in the rice district and Mississippi headwaters region in 1775.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1741</td>
<td>La Verendrye notes an alliance among the Grand Portage, Lake Nipigon, Kaministiquia, Rainy Lake, Ojibwe (?), Monsonis, Cree, and Assiniboine against the Sioux.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1763</td>
<td>Treaty of Paris cedes French possessions to Great Britain.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1767</td>
<td>Jonathon Carver reports a considerable band of Chippewas living at Rainy Lake; at Grand Portage he reports a large party of Cree and Assiniboine who had come there to trade. Grand Portage controlled by Ojibwe from the west.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1768</td>
<td>John Erskine erects a stockade and post at east end of the Grand Portage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1775</td>
<td>Alexander Henry the Elder reports that relations between the traders at Grand Portage were &quot;in a state of extreme reciprocal hostility.&quot; Hickerson characterizes the Native population at Grand Portage as &quot;a very small group enclistered about the trading depot.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1798</td>
<td>Decision to move the depot from Grand Portage north into British territory. Negotiations made with Ojibwe bands at Thunder Bay and Grand Portage to purchase lands on the Kaministiquia River.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1803</td>
<td>Fort Kaministiquia (later Fort William) established 45 miles north of Grand Portage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1805</td>
<td>XY Company merger with the North West Company.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1812–1815</td>
<td>War of 1812.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1821</td>
<td>North West Company merger with the Hudson’s Bay Company.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1824</td>
<td>Citing Schoolcraft, Hickerson believes that this dates the beginning of the Grand Portage Band as a named entity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1825</td>
<td>Treaty at Prairie du Chien; excluded Grand Portage Band.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1826</td>
<td>Treaty at Fond du Lac allows copper extraction from south side of Lake Superior; excluded Grand Portage Band.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1831</td>
<td>US Indian Agent Henry Schoolcraft records 12 men, 11 women, and 27 children at Grand Portage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1834</td>
<td>American Fur Company hires about 20 Grand Portage residents for fish between Grand Portage and Grand Marais.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1837</td>
<td>Treaty of July 29, 1837; excluded Grand Portage Band.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1838</td>
<td>64 people baptized by Fr. Pirez at Grand Portage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1839</td>
<td>Bushnell’s census gives Grand Portage a population of 135.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1842</td>
<td>Webster–Ashburton Treaty sets international border on Pigeon River; cession of Indian lands along south shore of Lake Superior and Isle Royale; excluded Grand Portage Band. American Fur Company fisheries close due to depressed market. Fr. Pirez sets up mission at mouth of the Pigeon River.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1843</td>
<td>Brunson’s census gives population of 145.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1847</td>
<td>Cession of Indian lands on upper Mississippi by Lake Superior and Mississippi River Ojibwe bands. Grand Portage census figures vary from 150 to 178.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1854</td>
<td>Treaty of La Pointe, September 30, 1854. Signers include La Pointe (14), Ontonagon (3), L’Anse (5), Vieux De Sert (2), Grand Portage (4), Fond du Lac (14), Lac Court Oreilles (14), Lac du Flambeau (11), Bois Fortes (3), and the Mississipi bands (15).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1855</td>
<td>Three distinct groups identified occupying northeastern Minnesota (Hickerson 1974): Grand Portage, Fond du Lac, and Bois Forte (or Vermillion Lake) Bands.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1875</td>
<td>Grand Portage census lists 262 band members.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1897</td>
<td>Grand Portage census lists 271 band members.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Nineteenth-century documentation clearly indicates that an aboriginal population including Ojibwa, Cree, and Assiniboine groups was present on the north shore of Lake Superior in the area of the Grand Portage and near the mouth of the Kaministikwia River at Fort William. From the last quarter of the eighteenth century into the first half of the nineteenth century the depot of the North West Company and (after the merger in 1821) the Hudson’s Bay Company served as a cultural and economic center for the surrounding region for whites and natives alike.

Previous Archeological Research at Grand Portage

Research at Grand Portage National Monument has been intermittent since the 1930s with most of the controlled excavation undertaken near the Great Hall and Depot to acquire data for reconstruction and interpretation. In more recent years, survey and excavation have focused on small-scale ground-disturbing development or shoreline stabilization projects. Woolworth and Woolworth (1982), and Noble (1989) summarize archeological research between 1936 and 1975. Noble’s overview indicates that, while there is a wealth of information on the fur trade era, relatively little archeological information pertains to the Terminal Woodland substage. In fact, almost nothing can be said regarding the prehistoric record of the Monument except by extrapolation from surrounding areas. In that regard, it was necessary to critically examine all archeological reports from the Monument to determine what is known about the Terminal Woodland substage there.

In 1936, Ralph D. Brown looked for evidence of stockade lines at the site of the depot. He reported “the existence of Indian material in small quantity” but gave no further description.

An undated memorandum to Russell Fridley, Director of the Minnesota Historical Society, from Elden Johnson (n.d.), Associate Professor, University of Minnesota, reports on the progress of field school excavations at the Monument held June 12–July 14, 1961. The excavations took place at the location of the present parking area and the XY Company area on opposite side of Grand Portage Creek.

The small area between the lakeshore road and the present shore line and east of the “XY” area was tested briefly and produced the most significant results. The area is a sand and gravel beach zone in which the lower levels of the test trenches produced flaked stone side scrapers of Indian manufacture apparently in direct association with early historic trade goods of European manufacture. Perhaps superficially, and without analysis of materials and data, this area looks as if it could be an early historic contact zone, perhaps of the French period [Johnson n.d.].

In the report of test excavations, June–September 1961, Woolworth describes Feature 19 as a probable prehistoric feature containing two scrapers, four jasper-taconite flakes, three mammal bone fragments and one 10” long metal rod. The feature was not described or illustrated in the report. In correspondence detailing the results of archeological excavations in 1962, Woolworth (1968) describes a prehistoric find: “Toward the close of the excavations, a prehistoric, probably pre pottery, lithic site was found. A finely flaked projectile point, a knife, three scrapers, and a number of flint chips definitely demonstrate that a group of prehistoric Indians once lived and hunted at Grand Portage many hundreds of years ago.” This was tentatively attributed to an Archaic culture on the basis of the absence of pottery. However, the base map places it at an elevation which would have been under water during the Archaic stage, and it is more likely that it represents a small ceramic Woodland stage occupation.

Four burials were found between 1962 and 1964. All were on the northeast side of Grand Portage Creek and although dispersed shared a similar orientation. The burials were adult, primary, and extended with abundant trade goods as offerings and appointments to the dead. Woolworth (1964) dates them between 1800 and 1825. (Unfortunately, the remains themselves were destroyed by fire where they were stored in the Great Hall; the associated grave goods are curated at Hamline University.) Although only four were found, the area is referred to as a “burial ground” in many of the notes and it is likely that more are present in this area of the Monument.
Also in the 1962 season summary report, some prehistoric chipped stone, but no ceramics, are described. Of note is an engraved slate with an incised image on both sides (Figure 13). The context of this find appears to be an exploratory trench where stockade posts were found, but there is no mention of other associations. The figure shown is very similar to others found on birchbark scrolls associated with the Midewiwin, or Grand Medicine Society. The Midewiwin was a society devoted to the lore of herbal curing which became increasingly popular during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries when traditional culture came under the stress of disease, warfare, and displacement. The French evidently left no record of the Midewiwin, leading some scholars to suggest that it was an historic phenomenon, although others believe that, as a secret healing society, it was probably not openly discussed in front of Europeans (Cornel 1986).

In his report on the 1963–1964 excavations, Woolworth (1964) reports a large, expanding stemmed projectile point from a cabin north of the blockhouse. It is described as “brown chalcedony” which is likely a form of Hudson’s Bay Lowland chert common on Terminal Woodland sites (Julig et al. 1992). In the 1970–1971 excavations, native artifacts are limited to one wooden net shuttle, three Micmac-style pipe fragments, five flakes, and one bone tube. “A bone tube of the type used by native doctors in curing rituals was found near the well” (Woolworth 1975:252).

The other area of Grand Portage National Monument that has received archeological attention is the opposite end of the portage at the site of Fort Charlotte. Here, too, the evidence is ephemeral. An underwater survey of Pigeon River here recovered “1 unfinished jaspilite projectile point, 5 prepared or utilized flakes, 24 assorted waste flakes of chalcedony, jaspilite, and chert: 1 variably cut and drilled piece of catlinite” (Wheeler et al. 1975:98).

An investigation of Fort Charlotte was undertaken in September of 1979 that involved the remapping surface features, a magnetometer survey to detect subsurface features, and shovel tests (Jones 1980). No prehistoric materials were recovered during this project.


Discussion

Focus on the fur trade facilities at Grand Portage and Fort Charlotte tell us next to nothing about the prehistoric or historic Indian presence there. The chipped stone is very likely from the Terminal Woodland substage, but only represents the fact that someone was here. The total absence of ceramics is telling. There was probably never any significant prehistoric occupation in the area selected by the North West Company for its depot. While this is true, it is also possible and indeed very likely that, if there was a sizeable prehistoric occupation, it was in an area outside the Monument where no archeological work has been conducted.

Mortuary Practices

The practices surrounding the treatment and burial of the dead were concerned with the proper care of the ancestors as an expression of reverence and respect for the dead by the living. It is important in a study of this nature to review different burial practices as a means by which future discoveries of burials may be evaluated as to age and cultural affiliation, and further, that they may be treated appropriately and respectfully by those people to which they are most likely related. The treatment of the dead is usually highly informative about degrees of inclusive/exclusiveness of human groups. It is also here that one often finds the most unique expressions of self-definition manifest in the burial ritual and goods accompanying the deceased. But, like everything else, one finds that these behaviors change through time and space, and that there is not just one type of burial or ritual activity that is specifically Ojibwe. The following discussion includes both prehistoric and historic mortuary sites and practices and, while not exhaustive, is representative.
Archeologists describe the mode of interment as being either primary or secondary. Primary burials include remains that are buried whole and relatively soon after death. Secondary burials occur after some modification of the remains, such as dismemberment, has taken place and the bones no longer in anatomical relation. The position of a primary burial can be extended, as in a lying position on its back, side, or face, or flexed in a sitting or fetal position. Secondary burials are usually bundled, possibly wrapped in skin or birchbark, but may be laid out to represent an articulated primary extended burial. Cremations also occur either as small, dispersed elements or in concentrations representing a single deposit in a container such as a hide or birchbark bag.
Mortuary Sites

Prehistoric burials range from isolated individuals to relatively elaborate group burials (ossuaries). Structured cemeteries with rigid grid-like organization familiar to most of us today do not appear until the historic stage. The Blackduck people practiced a variety of burial types. Kenyon (1986) describes a series of burial mounds in the Rainy River district of northwest Ontario and southeast Manitoba. Many are associated with Blackduck ceramics and are perhaps the best glimpse of prehistoric mortuary practices in the late prehistory of the western Lake Superior Basin.

About 900 years ago, a group of people who made pottery that we identify as Blackduck dug a broad, shallow saucer-shaped depression in the ground near the mouth of the Rainy River. The depression was roughly circular, with a diameter of about 10 1/2 feet (3.2 m) and a maximum depth of 2 feet (0.6 m). Individual skeletons were then wrapped in birchbark matting and placed in a shallow pit. Although a few were accompanied by grave furniture, most of them lacked such offerings. The individual skeletons, in turn, were derived from bodies that had been exposed at death until the flesh had disintegrated, as well as from bodies that had been dismembered... Evidence of the latter is present in the form of cut-marks at the ends of some of the long bones and at the bases of some of the skulls. These were made in the process of severing the heavier tendons and ligaments that bind the larger skeletal elements together. Occasionally, a member of this group would have had his brain removed after a circular hole had been punched through the occipital region of the skull. Finally, when all the bodies had been placed in the saucer-shaped depression, a low mound of earth was heaped over the mass grave [Kenyon 1986:47].

This describes but one episode at one mound to which later modifications, including intrusive individual and group burials and possibly cremations, were added. Other mounds showed traces of logs covering the central burial pit. Kenyon notes that the mounds in northwestern Ontario are typically built on points overlooking broad expanses of water, frequently on the south-facing sides suggesting a spring and summer season.

There is evidence of scalping and of the use of clay masks on some of the skulls. Artifact content is variable from site to site, but among the burial mounds in his study, ceramics appear to be almost invariably Blackduck (Kenyon 1986), or Selkirk (Arthurs, personal communication 1999), with little or no admixture of other Terminal Woodland types. This suggests that although campsites may contain a wide range of ceramics, the use of mounds and the ceremonies associated with them were confined to the Blackduck (or Selkirk) folk and not their neighbors. This contrasts with the mortuary behavior from the opposite end of Lake Superior where the Feast of the Dead stressed intergroup cooperation along the kinship idiom. Some of the burial mounds included copper kettles, glass beads, and other items of European manufacture, indicating continuity in mortuary practices from prehistory to history.

In the Lake of the Woods area an isolated individual was found buried in a sitting position, associated with a Blackduck vessel (Budak 1981). Another isolated transitional Laurel/Blackduck burial was excavated at the Martin-Bird site on Whitefish Lake (Dawson 1987). Here a single individual was buried in a secondary bundle, probably birch-bark wrapped, deposited in a pit where it was accompanied by a Blackduck vessel and a fragment of birch preserved by a copper pendant.

For the historic stage we have sometimes both the archeological evidence and an historic account of a burial ceremony. Usually we have either one or the other and must piece the two together to picture the mortuary behavior of the time. Not only did group membership play a part in deciding the type of burial an individual would have, family, clan, status, age, and manner of death would also play in important role. Political factors could also come into play as groups sought to make alliances with neighboring groups, as was the case with the Feast of the Dead, described more than once by Jesuit or French military observers. Cleland (1971) cites a number of first-hand accounts of the ceremony, including the commander at Fort de Baude (Saint Ignace,
Michigan) between 1694 and 1697, who describes in detail one Feast of the Dead. Characteristic is the large ossuary burials accompanied by days of feasting, mourning, and praying. Some involve lavish offerings that are subsequently retrieved from the dead and redistributed among the living, while in others the grave goods remain in the ossuary to be covered at the close of the ceremony.

The ceremony associated with the Feast and the treatment of the remains seems to find its archeological corollary in the Jutunen and Lasonen sites. At the Jutunen site at the Straits of Mackinac, McPherron (1967:281-232) describes a mid-fourteenth-century ossuary burial with 35 individuals interred at various stages of decomposition, including primary, fragmented secondary, bundles. Eleven bundles were placed in a prepared pit, inorganic matter and sand were placed over the burials, to which 24 additional burials were added. There was probably a bark lining placed on top of a second layer of remains. Grave goods with one male included one copper awl. A second ossuary contained eight individuals, a third ossuary contained six individuals, a fourth ossuary contained eight, and a fifth ossuary an additional eight. One primary burial of a child was not included in any of the ossuaries and was probably a later addition.

The Lasonen site near the Straits of Mackinac dates between A.D. 1670 and 1715 and may be attributed to any combination of Ottawa, Huron, or neighboring Algonquian bands, including the Saukis. The cemetery includes one small ossuary and a number of rectangular burial pits containing single or multiple individuals with accompanying grave offerings. Some are stone lined while others are not.

Burial at the Lakes Phase Sand Point site at the end of Keweenaw Bay in Upper Michigan was in or on prepared mounds. A rather complicated sequence of construction and use of Mound I was offered:

First, a sub-floor chamber was excavated and the pit lined with yellow sand preparatory to receiving the remains of five individuals. Next, a ramp-like primary mound of the same yellow sand was raised over this central burial pit, with the ramp rising in height from south to north. Human remains were buried either in pits dug into this ramp or merely placed on the surface of the ramp and covered over with a thin layer of sand. There now followed the erection of a substantial wood structure over the ramp. Stout vertical supports, having diameters of up to 30 cm, were set in place and a platform of lighter timbers built atop this framework. The cremated remains of four individuals, at least three of whom were children, are associated with this construction phase. Finally, after the wooden platform had been fired, a cap of midden fill collected from the area adjacent to the mound was deposited over the remains of the platform. As this cap layer accumulated, multiple or ossuary burials were placed in the mound (Cremin 1980:10).

Taken in concert with other burial sites in the region, notably the Jutunen site at the Straits of Mackinac (McPherron 1967), and the familiar mix of ceramics at the site, the Sand Point site mortuary can be seen as typically Terminal Woodland in its variability.

Warren (1974:72) stated that, "When an Ojibway dies, his body is placed in a grave, generally in a sitting posture, facing the west. With the body are buried all the articles needed in life for the journey." Although his familiarity was with the Ojibwe south of Lake Superior, it is interesting to note the sitting posture that, while not universal, was also seen at an isolated Blackduck burial in the Lake of the Woods noted above.

At the Monument, Woodworth described burials found during excavations on the northeast side of Grand Portage Creek in 1962:

Four adult (primary, extended) human burials, probably Chippewa Indians, ca. 1800-1825, were found. All of the burials were oriented with the heads to the west and the feet to the east. Among materials found with the burials were: brass bracelets, brass finger rings, a rusted fire steel, an adze, a corroded copper kettle, coiled brass wire hair ornaments, and black and white tubular (canon) beads... These burials were not made in a formal graveyard, but were random interments made over a considerable period of time, and so remote that local Indian traditions do not agree as to the existence
of burials at this location. All the skeletons were in poor condition, making it difficult, if not impossible to accurately determine the age and sex of the individuals [Woolworth 1968].

Writing from Leech Lake, Minnesota in 1833, William Johnston (1893:194) describes the circumstances of the death and the burial of a young man killed by an accidental discharge of a rifle:

The coffin was filled up, as is generally the case with the articles that the deceased was fond of, while living. His medicine sack was placed under his head, and on that touching his head, were placed the emblems of his warlike deeds, the War Eagles feathers... The burial ground was situated on a rising piece of ground nearly in the center of Pine Point; amidst a thick grove of tall norway pines... Here and there a small mound showed where others had gone to rest. Some coffins were high in the air, placed on scaffolds, one was the head chief's son; which was as some distance from the this; it attracted the eye, being more conspicuous that the others and its being painted with vermilion.

While scaffolds are usually associated with Plains traditional practices, there is one account of a scaffold burial at Grand Portage. In 1799 MacGillivray mentioned the “premier’s scaffold” at Grand Portage as a local landmark. According to Gilman (1992:73) the scaffold held the remains of a chief referred to as the Premier or Nectar, who was an ally of the British. The remains were placed on a scaffold at Grand Portage and later moved to Fort William. Gilman further states that, “As a mark of respect, the North West Company placed a British flag over the remains, an act that “was extremely gratifying to the Indians” (1992:73).

The use of the term “coffin” may be confused with “grave house” in some cases, and the distinction is not always clear. Coffins are understood to contain the actual remains of the dead with their grave goods, and probably were in use until well into the Historic period. Grave houses, on the other hand, were (and are) built over the actual grave. This was the place where offerings to the spirit of the dead were made, but did not contain the actual remains themselves. The antiquity of grave houses is not clear. They are mentioned in passing by Kohl (1985:373) in his history of the Lake Superior Ojibwe. Whether prehistoric or historic, they are not likely to long survive the passage of time unless maintained.

Although they likely participated in the Feast of the Dead, descriptions specific to the Ojibwe people, and more specifically to the Northern Ojibwe, seem to reflect a more intimate and exclusive practice of burial on the family, clan, or band level. Burial away from the major population centers such as the Sault and Straits of Mackinac should also reflect a minimum of external influence on burial practices. The Rainy River area to the west may represent, at least in prehistory, Northern Ojibwe (e.g., Blackduck/Selkirk) mortuary ritual of a communal nature, but without the multicultural influences seen to the east.

Discussion

The above characterization of prehistoric and historic burials illustrates the wide range of mortuary practices found in the region. Obvious limitations include the inability to associate a specific type with a specific group, except in special cases where a European observer provided a record of the participants. Alternatively, what is perceived as a limitation may overlook the equally obvious fact that there is no single mode of interment for any one group in the region, and that cultural affiliation based on mode of interment is virtually impossible. Even in a case where a culturally diagnostic item, such as a Blackduck pot, is associated with a burial, there is no absolute guarantee of the relationship of the deceased to that culture. The problem is further exacerbated in the historic stage when discrete groups, formerly discernable through their unique pottery, became archaeologically invisible as ceramics were replaced by products of European manufacture.

Miskwabik and Mishebeshu

The role of copper in the archeology, history, and religion of the Lake Superior region may tell us something of the people who had access to the copper resources of Isle Royale, and by extension, the Grand Portage Ojibwe. Copper was called Miskwabik, or the red metal, among the Ojibwe on both sides of Lake Superior and fulfilled
both spiritual and material needs as a substance for tools and ornamentation that was gifted to the people by an underwater manitous or spirit being. Copper has long gained the attraction of archeologists by its unique qualities (Martin 1999). True metallurgy was not achieved in North America, but the combination of cold-hammering and annealing of native copper resulted in elaborate artifacts found widespread throughout the Midwest and adjacent areas.

A discussion of copper and its religious meaning is tangential to this cultural affiliation study. Insofar as it appears that virtually all Algonquians had access to and used copper in some form in prehistory. It also appears that neighboring Siouan groups also had access to copper, although perhaps in a way limited by the costs of down-the-line exchange. However, the uniqueness and importance of copper as a cultural item frequently recovered archeologically demands some consideration.

**Geological and Cultural Context of Lake Superior Copper**

Native copper is found in the Keweenawan formation, which includes Isle Royale and the Keweenaw Peninsula of Northern Michigan. While the major bedrock sources of copper are found here, variable amounts of bedrock and loose copper have been found at the eastern end of Lake Superior and in the areas of glacial drift of Upper Michigan, Wisconsin, and Minnesota. For the northern Ojibwe and their immediate neighbors Isle Royale served as the primary source for copper, requiring either a canoe trip to the island to mine it or establishing trade relations with others who did (Clark 1991, 1995).

In the Terminal Woodland substage, copper on both sides of the lake was fashioned into a variety of small tools and ornaments, and distributed widely through the mechanisms of trade and exchange. A differential distribution of copper artifacts on archeological sites around Lake Superior suggests that the people of the Juntunen phase had a particular interest in copper. Copper artifacts are prevalent at the Juntunen site and on other Terminal Woodland sites exhibiting the usual mix of Juntunen, Blackduck, Selkirk, and Peninsular Woodland ceramics. However, away from the Lake Superior shore, the occurrence of copper drops off and, while present in small numbers on many Blackduck and Selkirk sites to the northwest, does not reach the quantities found on Juntunen phase sites (Clark 1991, 1995). This may be a function of distance from the source, or may have some cultural explanation, such as differential access to the resource. It was tentatively suggested that the Juntunen people may have exercised some form of control over copper on Isle Royale, or had a greater interest in it, while other resources, such as fish and caribou, were unrestricted. While this is unproven, it may hint that the scope of prehistoric Juntunen activity stretched as far west as Isle Royale, in concert with Hickerson's (1974) assertion that the Saulteaux were already well acquainted with the region at the time of their purported westward move in the sixteenth century.

**Historical Context of Lake Superior Copper**

Europeans first became aware of Great Lakes region copper in the early sixteenth century when copper ornaments were found among the Indians along the St. Lawrence. In the winter of 1535-1536 Cartier was entertained and intrigued by tales of the "Kingdom of Saguenay" which lay in some ambiguous direction to the north and west and from whence had come the copper objects in possession of his hosts, the St. Lawrence Iroquois. In subsequent years there was a flow of information concerning the source of copper. In 1603 Champlain's Huron informants described a copper mine somewhere to the north where they had obtained some bracelets. Seven years later on a trip upriver from Quebec, Champlain encountered some Montagnais and a single Algonkin who presented him with a piece of native copper said to have been obtained from the bank of a river (Biggar 1925).

With the establishment of a permanent French presence in Huronia (southwestern Ontario) and the burgeoning fur trade, more substantive information concerning the sources of copper was forthcoming. Penetration into the Superior Basin by the traders Brule and Grenoble around 1625 brought back copper specimens and more tales of mining from Indians living in the Lake Superior basin. No mines were actually visited, however, and much
of the information was couched in vague and often mythic language. In his review of references to copper in the Jesuit Relations, Whittlesey (1863) concludes that all such references prior to 1847 are, at best, secondhand in nature. Daillon (Thwaites, Jesuit Relations 1669-1670) makes mention of the tradition of a floating island of gold 40 or 50 leagues north of the Sault and opposite Michipicoten Island. In 1739 the French engaged in limited prospecting at the bidding of De la Ronde, who employed two German miners in the Ontonagon area of Upper Michigan. Alexander Henry, in 1771, established a mine on the Ontonagon River that failed the following year.

European interest in the mineral resources of the region appears to have focused on the Ontonagon area and not Isle Royale. It is indeed surprising that so few references to the island exist for this period, given the traffic between Grand Portage and Montreal. Even Captain Johnathon Carver, who spent some time at Grand Portage in 1767 and was a collaborator with Henry on the Ontonagon mining project, failed to note the presence of the island in his survey and manuscript journals (Parker 1976:145ff). However, Carver did remark on the island in his published journal (Parker 1976). Carver’s cartographic report of Lake Superior apparently drew heavily from extant sources when the major islands of the lake were plotted, and it is highly unlikely that he ever visited Isle Royale.

Euro-Americans mining of copper and silver did not begin on Isle Royale until the 1840s by which time any tangible link between the prehistoric miners and their historic descendants had been largely obscured by the processes of cultural change, or went unnoticed and unreported by early writers in the region. No European left an account of a Native American actively mining copper and historic records of its use are few. Father Fremiot reported in 1850 that, “four savage families of the Riviere aux Toudres [Pigeon River] had passed the winter at Tutt’s Harbour [on Isle Royale]. The men and the young people had been employed in the work outside of the mine and had earned a salary which let them live in comfort” (Fremiot in Cadieux 1973:626). Clearly, these people, presumably Ojibwe, had no fear of handling copper as they engaged in the cash for labor economy of the early mining industry.

The use of native copper items as grave goods, sometimes alongside European trade goods, in historic contexts is known. It seems likely that there was a relatively rapid replacement of copper tools of native manufacture by functionally equivalent items of European origin obtained through trade. However, the change from copper to iron and brass did not negate the reverence for native copper by the Ojibwe (Halsey 1983).

Copper and Ojibwe Beliefs

While in no way restricted to the groups identified as Jantunen phase, the apparent interest in copper by the Algonquian people who traversed the north shore of Lake Superior between Isle Royale and the Straits of Mackinac suggests that, for them, copper may have held special significance. Even though copper mining technology and the use of copper tools had disappeared by the time European observers were on the scene, there is a vestigial remnant of a tradition suggesting that it was an important substance to the Ojibwe who continued to revere it after it had ceased to serve any technological needs (Halsey 1983: Kohl 1985).

The most important figure associated with copper by the Ojibwe was variously called Underwater Manitou, Underwater Panther, Long-Tailed Underwater Panther, Muthebetshu or Michi-Pielheu, the Great Lynx, Veesey’s (1983:74-75) extensive treatment is quoted here at length:

The Underwater Manitou influenced the abundance and availability of land and sea animals. With its numerous underwater allies it controlled all game, withholding animals and fish from its enemies. The early Lake Superior Ojibwas offered it sacrifices to obtain good fishing, and in the Creation Myth Nanabozho fought it to secure the right to hunt for future Indians. The Underwater Manitou possessed great and dangerous powers. It could cause rapids and stormy waters; it often sank canoes and drowned Indians, especially children. The Ojibwas associated it with the sudden squall waters of the Great Lakes which prevented fishing, even picturing it in the shape of
Lake Superior itself... Some Ojibwas thought of the Underwater Manitou as a thoroughly malicious creature.

It was not totally evil, however. In some traditions, it fed and sheltered those who fell through the winter ice. It offered medicinal powers to those who accepted it as guardian... It gave copper to the Indians, who cut the metal from the being’s horns as it raised them above the surface of the water... Those who attempted to take the copper without offering proper payment met severe punishment from the Underwater Manitou. It was a creature to inspire terror and awe, as well as reverence. Without the aid or benign neglect of this being – part snake, part catfish, part lynx, part mountain lion – the Ojibwas would surely starve or suffer death in raging waters.

Theresa Smith’s (1995) discussion of Mishebeshu provides little in the way of a linkage between copper and the underwater beings, but gives valuable insight into the physical and spiritual context of this being in the Ojibwe belief system. The dread of Mishebeshu and his potential presence in all bodies of water together with the association with copper suggests that water was his element and copper his substance. Looking at Isle Royale as the most significant source of copper for the north shore Indians, the need to propitiate Mishebeshu for both the travel across the lake to the island and the extraction of copper suggests that the island was, in a real sense, his island. The act of mining copper may have been seen as an intrusion into Mishebeshu’s domain, the tools of mining as the weapons by which the copper was won from him. Or perhaps a truce was made between the miners and Mishebeshu who could still exact his toll on the travelers on their return to the mainland. The relationship between the Ojibwe and copper is an interesting one, but entirely speculative since there is no record of any ritual associated with copper mining.

The story of “Wild Men and Giant Snakes” as told by Chief Norma Fox of the Cockburn Island Ojibwa in eastern Lake Superior indicates that copper may be associated with other manitous as well:

There is also a legend that an Indian was canoeing on Lake Superior, and suddenly the water became very turbulent. The Indian man was sure he would drown. A big snake was pulling at his canoe, so the Indian stuck his fish spear into the giant serpent’s back. When he pulled the spear up, a piece of the snake’s flesh was stuck onto the end of the spear. The flesh turned out to be pure copper [Conway and Conway 1990:29].

Ritual offerings to water manitous prior to making long trips or dangerous crossings are, however, well documented. Isle Royale’s Metis John Linklater reported that, “his [Ojibwe] wife’s grandmother, and his own grandfather, remembered coming to Isle Royale. The latter recalled the gathering on the Canadian shore and the ceremonies, the dance and the appeal to the Spirits, that were deemed necessary before the trip could be made” (Fox 1929:317-319). A Junctunen phase Terminal Woodland dog burial found on Isle Royale was almost certainly a ritual act, but it will never be known if the purpose was related to a water crossing, copper mining, or the alleviation of sickness (Clark 1990).

The use of copper in prehistory seems to map onto the range of the Lake Superior Ojibwe and Ottawa better than that of any other group. Although the use of copper changed through time and was ultimately deleted from the cultural repertoire as a material from which tools were made, there is a persistence of its use as items of personal adornment. Further, the tradition of the association of copper with Mishebeshu, and the reverence held toward large pieces of copper by the Algonquians of the upper lakes, may signal the lineage of a tradition more interested in copper than its neighbors.

Summary and Conclusions

The prehistoric record of archeological cultures in and around the Lake Superior Basin suggests that there was a distribution of pottery styles, very roughly correlated to historic ethnic groups, that anticipated the historic distribution of “tribes.” In this “just-so” explanation, it must be remembered that we are talking about archeological cultures separated by time and not distinct tribes in the historic sense.
The archeological co-occurrence of Blackduck and Selkirk pottery signals great time-depth to the purported historic association of the Northern Ojibwe and Cree. Even in the absence of perfect chronological or stratigraphic control, we can see that the archeological record is indicating a mixed composition as the mode for virtually all major archeological sites in the Superior basin. The distribution of Peninsular Woodland ceramics around the Lake Superior Basin suggests that an Algonquian archeological culture, closely allied to the historic Chippewa, Fox, Sauk, and Potawatomi, may have come form the south and east around A.D. 700. The pattern established by the Peninsular Woodland people was continued by the Juntunen phase people from the Straits of Mackinac.

Juntunen phase ceramics suggest that these Algonquian speakers, perhaps proto-Saulteaux but equally likely Ottawa and/or Nipissing, were already familiar with the entire Superior basin. If only on a seasonal basis, at least 200 years before contact with the French. Like Peninsular Woodland, the distribution of Juntunen ceramics suggests the Saulteaux-Ottawa/Nipissing were moving along both the north and south shores of Lake Superior.

The meaning of Ojibwe is complex with geographical, historical, as well as ethnic cognates. What ultimately became Ojibwe probably began near the Sault where early French accounts identified the Saulteaux and/or Ootchibou in the mid-seventeenth century. The fact that the Ojibwe are not identified in the western Lake Superior basin until much later may be a function of several things. The postulated westward expansion of the Ojibwe invokes a variety of explanations. Those in the catastrophic category include pressure from eastern tribes, the desire to escape from warfare, smallpox and/or depletion of fur-bearing animals. Population growth and the need to expand to fulfill the needs of the people were cited by Schenck (1997) who stated that the consequences of the Ojibwe occurred at about the time of contact. It has also been suggested that the opportunities afforded by participation in the fur trade, either as middlemen or as direct trappers and traders, stimulated the move west.

Greenbarg and Morrison (1982) argued that the phenomenon of names being applied to groups by Europeans gave a false impression of westward movement, and should be considered as one explanation of the perception of a westward expansion of Ojibwe. In their explanation, the name Ojibwe moves west and is applied to both the emigrants from the Sault and the prior Algonquian residents of the north shore.

The effective unit of a westward expansion was probably via the smallest effective social unit: the family or at most the band, not a wholesale emigration by disenfranchised Saulteaux. Neither was it the diaspora as experienced by the Huron and their allies as they fled the depredations of the Iroquois. The increments of this expansion may have been a combination of long moves, virtually from one end of the lake to the other, and by small seasonal moves on a very gradual basis. Any hypothesized movement or migration did not occur in a vacuum. In contrast to Hickerson's assertion that, contrary to the archeological evidence, much of the area was vacant at the time of the westward expansion, Cree and Cree-Ojibwe, and likely Siouan groups, were very much in place prior to the historic move from the Sault. If anything is clear from the archeological record it is that the basin was continuously occupied, and it is likely that it was an array of Algonquian and Siouan-speaking groups than were met by any sort of proto-Ojibwe group moving west.

It is entirely conceivable that the "westward move" actually occurred over a period of ca. 300-500 years as a normal process of the seasonal cycle. Associations among the Saulteaux, Nipissing, and others in the east as well as many of the western groups ultimately give rise to the historic Northern Ojibwe. This does not conflict with the generally accepted westward migration following 1680 as the Ojibwe of the Sault sought to improve their position in the fur trade.

The relationship among the Northern Ojibwe and the Chippewa of Upper Michigan, and Wisconsin in early historic times is not well known. Archeologically, the prehistoric records strongly suggest that there were few if any trips across Lake Superior and there are no data that indicate that south shore groups had any traffic with north shore groups or their resources until thrust into a very untraditional association by the demarcation of the
international border between the United States and Canada. At this juncture, treaties involving the cession of lands and rights to resources brought groups together that formerly had little or no intercourse, but were now identified under the general term Chippewa.

Based on previous archeological investigations, the Ojibwe in general and the Grand Portage Band in particular are archeologically invisible at Grand Portage. There are no means by which the Grand Portage Band can be distinguished from the Rainy Lake Band, or any other neighboring bands. The prehistoric record is limited to nondiagnostic chipped stone tools and waste flakes reflecting the typical array of Gunflint formation sources from the nearby Canadian Shield. No ceramics found at Grand Portage can be used to infer which archeological cultures may have been present. It appears likely that there was, in fact, no substantial Indian community here until after Grand Portage became an entrepot of the fur trade, although systematic archeological survey could alter this assertion.

Mortuary practices tell us little about either the archeological or ethnohistoric cultures present in the area. On the regional level there are interesting differences with respect to communal and intertribal ceremonies such as the Feast of the Dead in the eastern Lake Superior Basin while evidence from the Rainy River area indicates exclusive mortuary rituals practiced by the Blackduck/Selkirk people. However, for the most part, the variability in the treatment of the dead seems to reflect achieved status, manner of death, place of death, and season of death, rather than a strict set of culturally discrete parameters unique to one culture and not another.

The use of copper was not restricted to the Ojibwe or to any of the prehistoric archeological cultures of the region. The relative abundance of copper on Juntunen phase sites from Isle Royale to the Straits of Mackinac indicate a great time depth for travel to and/or interaction with groups from both ends of the Lake Superior Basin. It also brings into question any notion of a vacant or abandoned land into which the Ojibwe eventually moved. While unproved, the traditional reverence for copper into the Historic stage may signal the persistence of a relationship between the Ojibwe and copper from earlier times.

In sum, while the Grand Portage Band cannot be identified from archeological remains, it seems clear that their history involved elements of stability and movement, coupled with close relations with neighboring bands of north shore Ojibwe and Cree, but with diminishing intercourse with southern Ojibwe groups of northern Wisconsin and Michigan until the mid-nineteenth century, and then only in treaty situations. If the identification of Selkirk and Blackduck ceramics as ancestral to the historic Cree and Northern Ojibwe is correct, then the ancestral Grand Portage Band and their neighbors have been in place for at least 300 years, during which time they received their identity as Ojibwe as related groups, including the Juntunen archeological culture of prehistory and the Saulteaux of history, moved westward from the eastern Lake Superior Basin. Coalescence into today's Grand Portage Band was a consequence of several "centralizing" forces, including the trade depots and their cash and barter economy, treaties with land and/or resource cession, the creation of the international border, and the role of the church and schools in community life.

Given the nature of the fur trade Depot at Grand Portage, human remains found there could conceivably belong to any of the Native American/First Nation groups who participated in the trade as employees or independent traders, although in terms of overall probability Ojibwe/Cree would be the most likely. It is also probable that claims of cultural affiliation could be made with First Nation groups now residing in Canada.

What is clear is that the creation of what became Ojibwe was an additive process of different groups through time. They shared a common cultural background but exhibited differences in lineage expressed in clan and band membership, and further manifest in aspects of their material culture, most notably for the archeologist, pottery. The migrants and visitors from the east did not find a vacant land waiting to fulfill a native manifest destiny, but a land already peopled by ones they could identify as relatives of a degree. The mechanisms of the centuries of interaction, fusion, and fusion of these groups that ultimately gave rise to the Ojibwe of history will perhaps never be fully understood.
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Appendix A: Project Statements

These project statements are provided to give direction to possible future studies and resource management needs for Grand Portage National Monument and the lands of the Grand Portage Band of Minnesota Chippewa. While only sketches of research designs, they provide the scope and purpose of several possible projects.

Conduct Archeological Survey to Establish Resource Inventory

A comprehensive archeological survey should be undertaken to identify and document prehistoric and historic cultural properties within the lands of the Grand Portage Band of Minnesota Chippewa. The purpose is to identify significant resources and to incorporate them into a management plan. These data could be used to develop a plan to monitor sites for illegal looting or natural destruction such as erosion or fire. The study would also provide initial data useful in planning ground-disturbing activities such as road realignment or construction of new facilities.

Additionally, knowledge of the distribution and types of archeological sites around Grand Portage National Monument could potentially contribute a great deal to the understanding of the evolution of the Grand Portage community. Questions regarding the relationships among Native American/First Nation groups prior to European contact, and subsequent relationships with the French and British could be addressed.

While the entire area should be surveyed, a tentative priority is suggested:

1. All currently developed and proposed development areas
2. Grand Portage Island
3. Waswagoning Bay
4. The mouth of the Pigeon River
5. Basswood Lake
6. Other interior locations

Create and Maintain a GIS layer for cultural properties on Grand Portage Band/NPS lands

As a management tool for the present and the future, a geographic information systems (GIS) layer with all cultural properties should be created. This will serve as an aid to both management and scientific investigation of prehistoric and historic sites. A GIS layer could be used to identify earlier beach ridges where Archaic sites may be located. It could be used to highlight areas of shoreline attrition that may be affecting later archeological sites. As a predictive tool useful in planning, a GIS layer could be used to identify areas were sites are likely to occur.

National Register Evaluation Testing on Selected Sites

Minimal testing of archeological sites would provide contextual data and an evaluation of the integrity of a site. The determination of the depth and content of archeological sites can be accomplished by the excavation of a very small number of 1-m² units. Similar techniques on Isle Royale were successful in this regard. The very limited approach has the advantage of obtaining a maximum of information while leaving all but a few meters of the site undisturbed. Testing would be required to address questions of a cultural/historical nature, as well as identifying those sites of special significance to the local community.

Direct Dating of Cooking Residues on Ceramics

The problems associated with understanding the dynamics of the prehistoric cultures of the Lake Superior Basin require specific dates from ceramics. Radiocarbon samples derived from hearth features or midden deposits date the whole assemblage of typically diverse ceramics on a site, but do little to unravel the complex cultural history responsible for their deposition. Prehistoric ceramics in the Upper Great Lakes are blessed with an abundance of organic cooking residues resulting from their use which directly date the vessel's use and not
the accidents or circumstances of its deposition. Sufficient samples of ceramics with dateable materials exist in NPS (e.g., Voyageurs National Park, Isle Royale National Park) and other collections that would be appropriate for a study of this nature.

*Trace Element Analysis (NAA) of Prehistoric Ceramic Clays*

Building on previous work, a large suite of samples taken from both geological sources and from Terminal Woodland vessels should be subjected to trace element analysis. The results would be used to test the findings of previous studies that suggested that ceramic types with close affinities to the Straits of Mackinac were being produced on clays obtained on Isle Royale. Other evaluations of cultural/historical relationships, especially the Blackduck/Selkirk relationship, and the overall relationship of Peninsular Woodland ceramics to all other types, could be made.
Appendix B: Step-by-Step Evaluation of an Unanticipated Discovery Situation

The following is based on the assumption that a qualified professional archeologist is available for the field evaluation. The protocol of notification and consultation is not addressed. The approach is a strictly archeological one designed to ascertain the most likely cultural affiliation of human remains. Certain analytical techniques, such as osteological and biochemical analysis, may or may not be deemed appropriate, but are offered here as the archeologist's best effort to obtain the desired results. Given the results of the study, any determination of cultural affiliation must be seen as a statement of probability rather than of certainty.

I. Are the Remains Human or Non-Human?

This may not always be as straightforward as one may think. Cremations, bundle burials, and heavily disturbed burials may not be immediately recognized as such. Animal bones may be present as grave offerings as an item of personal adornment, social significance (such as clan membership), or individual power. Further, while not falling under NAGPRA, the discovery of an animal burial may signal the remains of a ritual act. Burials of dogs and bears are not uncommon in the Upper Great Lakes and should not be treated casually if encountered in an archeological setting.

II. Are the Remains Native American or Other?

This significant question will affect the subsequent handling. Two approaches are presented below: one from a physical science perspective, the other anthropological. Even with the most skilled analysts, this distinction may be an impossible one to make. For example a Metis, or mixed-blood individual will likely have physical characteristics reflecting both Native American and Euroamerican genetics, and could be buried with any combination of artifacts.

III. Are There Skeletal Attributes That Indicate Ethnic Affiliation?

Examination by a physical anthropologist could result in an assessment of probability of biological affiliation. Human populations are characterized by unique physical characteristics or epigenetic attributes. Native American groups may be distinguished from non-Indian groups at a certain level by the presence of some attributes. Among these are shovel-shaped incisors and certain configuration of the cusps of molars. While DNA studies are technically the best means of determining biological distance, the absence of population studies as well as the destructive nature of the analysis renders this option unlikely. Biological affiliation is not the same as cultural affiliation, but determination of the former may be useful in an assessment of the latter.

IV. What is the Mode of Interment?

Does the type of burial suggest a cultural affiliation? A coffin burial in an organized cemetery is more likely to represent a non-Indian than a flexed burial wrapped in birch bark and accompanied by clay vessels. This element will not necessarily be a conclusive indication of cultural affiliation, but may, in concert with other evidence, be an aid in determination. Remains occurring in any type of grave other than a primary extended one are likely Native American. If a formal patterning of the graves is evident, particularly one which is in a linear or grid pattern, then it is likely that the burials are either Euro-American or Native American with Christian influence.

V. Are There Grave Goods or Other Artifacts with the Burial?

Conspicuous goods, such as clay pots, kettles, ax heads, beads, knives, or jewelry are common. What may be overlooked in the context of an accidental discovery are items such as coffin nails, bits of sawn lumber, birch bark wrappings, or remnants of fabric and leather. The absence of grave goods does not necessarily mean that the remains are either prehistoric or historic.
VI. Are the Grave Goods Prehistoric, Historic, or a Combination?

This determination will begin the process of establishing an age assessment of the burial. A grave containing only precontact goods is likely to be prehistoric; a combination may be earlier than one with only goods of non-native manufacture.

VII. What are the Dates of the Artifacts?

Each type of artifact will have a date or more likely a range of dates associated with its manufacture and use established by the discovery of similar artifacts at other sites. This assessment will establish a minimum and maximum date range for the burial.

VIII. Are the Artifacts Attributable to a Specific Archeological Culture?

If native-made clay pottery is present, what style(s) is represented? Is only one type present or is more than one present? If Blackduck and/or Selkirk are present, then it is possible that the remains are those of a Northern Ojibwe and/or Cree individual. If Juntunen pottery is present, it is possible that the remains belong to a somewhat earlier proto-Ojibwe archeological culture. If Peninsular Woodland is present then the remains may be those of an Algonquian-speaker whose tribal affiliation is unknown.

If the associated artifacts are strictly of non-Native manufacture, but other lines of evidence suggest that the remains are Native American, then it is unlikely that any further cultural affiliation can be determined.

As a cautionary note, it is not uncommon for artifacts to be introduced into a burial accidentally, especially on a busy site where there are many artifacts remaining from previous occupations. The excavation of a burial pit and its subsequent filling may result in the unintentional mixing of earlier artifacts into a later context.

The inability to reach an unequivocal determination of cultural affiliation should not be seen as a failure, since under normal archeological circumstances, one is usually provided with only pieces of the puzzle. This is compounded in our case by historical uncertainties of cultural identities among living groups that have no archeological counterparts. Even under the best of circumstances, the determination of cultural affiliation will be a probability statement or "best guess" on the part of the investigators.